FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 095

17 May 1982

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Soviet Reaction to Reagan Eureka Speech AA 1
Shishkin Commentary AA 1
Kondryashev Analysis AA 1
Soltan Comments on Reagan Press Conference AA 3
FRG TV Interviews USSR's Arbatov on Disarmament AA 4
Commentary on U.S. Nuclear Testing Position [Dmitriyev] AA 5
Paper Attacks Reagan 'Nuclear Blackmail' AA 5
[Svetovidov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 May]
Materials on Disarmament Conference in Japan AA 8
Zatsepin, Kuchko Report AA 8
Tyazhelnikov Address [Tsvetov] AA 9
Tyzhelnikov Interviewed on Arms, Other Issues [KYODO] AA 10

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]
Movements Against Nuclear War CC 1
Reagan's Latest Speech CC 1
Reagan Press Talk, SALT-II CC 2
Bush PRC Visit CC 4
Middle East Situation CC 4
Falklands Issue CC 5
Warsaw Pact Policies CC 7

FALKLANDS ISLANDS CRISIS

Moscow Examines Anglo-Argentine Conflict [Kondryashev] DD 1
Moscow Scores Washington for Supporting UK [Barisov] DD 3
Soviet Foreign Ministry Submits Protest to UK [Mashkin] DD 4

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Zorin Commentary on U.S. Budget Dispute A 1
Senators Criticize Reagan Arms Proposals A 2
Australian Prime Minister Arrives in U.S. A 3
SR-71 Makes Forced Landing in Northern Norway A 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 May]

CHINA

Volskiy on Bush's PRC Visit, U.S.-PRC Relations B 1
PRC Report on Suppression of Afghans Attacked [Kornilov] B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

USSR, Japan Sign Kelp-Gathering Accord in Moscow C 1
Kim Il-song Thanks Brezhnev for Greetings C 1
[PRAVDA 11 May]

SOUTH ASIA

TV Carries Predeparture Remarks by DRA's Karmal D 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Reportage on End of Visit of Kampuchea's Hun Sen E 1
Visit to Armenia E 1
Visit to Sochi E 1
Visit End; Vacation Beginning E 1
Tikhonov Receives SRV's Order of Gold Star E 1
SRV Foreign Minister on U.S. Chemical Warfare [NOVOYE VREMYA] E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

CPSU's Rusakov Departs for Visit to Warsaw F 1
Polish Government Discusses Public Disorder F 1
Tikhonov Condolences on Yugoslav Mine Disaster F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Haig Visit to Pressure Greek Government G 1
IZVESTIYA Views U.S. Envoy's Paris TV Comments [14 May] G 1
Osipov Press Conference on 'Gas-Pipes' Deal G 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

IZVESTIYA Reports Party, Government Resolutions [11 May] R 1
CPSU's Grishin Addresses Moscow Meeting R 2
Shcherbitskiy Interviewed To Mark Anniversary R 2
Shevardnadze Attends Georgian CP Plenum R 3
Committee Notes Armenians' Return to Homeland R 3
Lithuanians Appeal for Religious Rights [Vatican City] R 3

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 14-16 May Reported T 1
Spring Agricultural Situation Reviewed T 2
CSA Figures [IZVESTIYA 7 May] T 2
Spring Sowing Progress [Astakov] T 3
Agriculture Official's Report T 4
Irrigation Projects Extend Into Kara Kum Desert T 5
Briefs: Turkmen Fine-Fiber Cotton; Namangan Rice T 5

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Soyuz T-5 Links Up With Salyut-7 Orbital Station U 1
Space Complex Parameters U 1
Reactivation of Salyut U 2
TASS Reports Launch of Cosmos-1365 Satellite U 2

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Ustinov Address at Army Conference Reported V 1

SOVIET REACTION TO REAGAN EUREKA SPEECH

Shishkin Commentary

LD150306 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 14 May 82

[Gennadiy Shishkin commentary]

[Text] Try as you will, you will find no sign in the President's Eureka speech of a serious desire to reduce strategic arms in a way suitable to both sides. True, the President did say his administration has finally decided to enter into negotiations after dragging its feet for a year and a half. But the proposals he made suggest that Washington seeks not an agreement that would end the danger of a nuclear arms race, but military advantages for the United States. President Reagan says he would like to see a cutback in strategic forces, yet his administration refuses to ratify SALT-II, the agreement that cleared the way for further agreements to slash these weapons. SALT-II, after all, was the result of long and difficult talks at a variety of levels, carried on by three American administrations. It reflects a careful balance of interests. Everything in the treaty was weighed again and again. Because of this the two sides agreed to sign it. At the time they did so the Soviet Union had more delivery vehicles and the United States more warheads, and the Soviet Union agreed that if the treaty came into effect it would somewhat reduce the number of delivery vehicles. At that same time a joint Soviet-American statement was signed in Vienna, in June 1979, laying down the principles and main directions of subsequent talks to limit strategic arms. In short, the agreements reached at that time ensured the most favorable conditions for new agreements, for considerable reductions in strategic arms in a framework of equality and like security.

But the process broke down when Washington refused to ratify SALT-II. The Republican administration would have nothing to do with the treaty, and instead gave new impetus to the nuclear arms race, hoping to achieve superiority over the Soviet Union. What is more, the new American programs call for the development of weapons that would be difficult if not impossible to control. Senator Gary Hart has noted that President Reagan said nothing in his speech about the United States planning to limit its nuclear potential and did not urge slowing down the race in strategic nuclear weapons.

The administration is apparently obsessed with the idea of gaining advantages for the United States at the expense of the Soviet Union's security. Significantly, the President makes no secret of the fact that he believes the negotiations of the eighties should ensure a genuine and long-term limitation of Soviet military programs, though clearly the United States does not intent to assume the same commitment.

What all this means is that President Reagan expects the Soviet Union to disarm unilaterally. The Soviet Union would never agree to this, of course. It expects a more objective and serious approach of its partner at the coming talks. And it hopes the talks will lead to an agreement acceptable to both sides and beneficial for worldwide peace and security.

Kondryashev Analysis

LD162234 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 May 82

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by IZVESTIYA political observer Stanislav Kondrashev]

[Text] Let us now turn to a topic which unfailingly appears in almost all the International Panorama broadcasts. It is the subject of the arms race and disarmament, and the increased threat of a nuclear war. A concrete reason for another return to this topic is the speech delivered last Sunday by U.S. President Ronald Reagan at the college of a small town, Eureka, in the state of Illinois, where he once studied.

Some consider this speech the most important foreign policy statement by the American President in the entire time he has been in power. Reagan said, as he expressed himself about the future of the relations between the West and the Soviet Union. [sentence as heard] At the beginning of June he will fly to West Europe for the first time as President to meet the NATO partners, and so he announces beforehand -- and I quote -- this most important problem, namely the problem of the future of relations between the West and the Soviet Union, will be behind all my discussions with all the European leaders. That means that the speech in Eureka is an element of preparation for the first appearance of the American President on the West European scene.

I have noted three points in the speech. First of all I will talk about the Soviet threat which requires, as the American President said, the unity of the West and, first of all, agreement by others with America. The second point is the offer to begin talks with the Soviet Union concerning the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons at the end of June. The third point: a general outline of the plan for the gradual reductions which according to the words of the President, will be offered by the American delegation at the talks.

Let us take the second point: The proposal to begin American-Soviet talks on strategic weapons at the end of June. The talks are needed but let us see on what ground and with what delay the American proposal appeared. Ronald Reagan came to the White House at the end of January last year, and by the end of February last year, from the platform of the 26th CPSU Congress in Moscow, came the invitation to renew talks on strategic weapons. That is almost 1 and 1/2 years, which is 1/3 of the President's 4-year term, the Americans refrained from answering this invitation. Why did they not hurry? Well, that is known -- it is because they gave preference to the program for the modernization of their strategic forces, the mobile MX, ICBM's, the new B-1 supersonic strategic bombers, the Trident-2 missile systems for submarines and so forth. If now in Washington they talk about readiness for talks, there is only one explanation for this: the pressure of public opinion which can no longer be opposed. To show which moods the Reagan administration has produced with its militaristic policy I shall quote two remarks, one by a reader who sent a letter to the U.S. weekly TIME and the other by a Washington journalist.

Here is what reader (Patrick Grace) writes: Reagan himself and his military plans have replaced the USSR in the role of the worst enemy of America because these plans have quickly returned us from detente to the era of the cold war which threatens to turn into a very hot one. And further, (Patrick Grace) writes: As one well-known humorist has noted: We have at last met our enemy, and he is us. Not badly said. Americans have been frightened with the Soviet Threat and they have not begun to be afraid of people who try to frighten others. And journalist (Michael Brown) of the Washington POST asks the question: Why are there so many people expressing their concern as if they have just learned about the existence of nuclear weapons? And then he answers: Any political observer will give you an answer straight away. Ronald Reagan is the reason. According to the opinion of many Americans and Europeans concerning Reagan, the danger that we may find ourselves involved in a nuclear war is far greater than with any of his predecessors. You reap what you sow. The present Washington leaders are reaping unexpected crops of alarm and fear. One harvest of fear they gathered last fall in West Europe where an unprecedented antinuclear and antiwar movement developed against the American policy and they are now reaping another one in America itself.

You can say that the American President is defending himself from himself, from the image which he built for himself through his talks about super armament and the possibility of a limited nuclear war. The first time he defended himself was last November when he was forced to agree to talks on nuclear weapons in Europe.

And he was forced to agree under the pressure of the West European public. The speech in Eureka was also defensive. Here is what was written about this speech a week before it was delivered by New York TIMES observer (Leslie Gallup). According to the words of executives, the administration is interested most of all in announcing officially some simple all-embracing plan in order to demonstrate that the Reagan command is voting for peace and which would take out the fuss out of the campaign for a moratorium on nuclear weapons which has developed in Europe and the United States. Further on, (Leslie Gallup) explains: In the opinion of highly placed representatives of the administration, these movements undermine the support for the new American nuclear weapons.

The third point in the American President's speech is his plan for reducing strategic weapons. The plan is being presented under the slogan of stability of correlation of nuclear power but it is formulated in such a manner that it actually signifies destabilization, and a dangerous advantage for the American side. Because of this, in America itself, nonbiased observers received this plan with open scepticism. I shall quote only one opinion, TIME magazine, and here is what that magazine writes: The ceiling offered by Reagan for nuclear weapons would require of the U.S. a considerably smaller reduction of strategic systems than of the Soviet Union. This proposal is so much in favor of the U.S., the magazine continues, so let us rather ask the question about the feasibility and even about the sincerity of the approach of the administration to the establishment of control over weapons.

SOLTAN COMMENTS ON REAGAN PRESS CONFERENCE

LD141532 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 14 May 82

[Yuriy Soltan commentary]

[Text] At a recent press conference in Washington President Ronald Reagan has restated his administration's resolve to build up arms and strengthen the Armed Forces of the United States. As he did on previous occasions, our commentator Yuriy Soltan says, the U.S. President was referring to the need of catching up with the Soviet Union in the military field, to the growth of a Soviet military threat. And just as before no proofs were furnished. Yet no assertions can conceal the truth, and the truth is that in the world in general, and in Europe in particular, there exists approximate military parity between the Soviet Union and the United States -- and also between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO. Thus, take for example strategic arms: When the Soviet-American SALT II treaty was being drafted — a document which has been shelved by the present American administration -- experts thoroughly measured the balance of strategic nuclear forces. Their conclusion was that with regard to the number of strategic arms delivery vehicles the sides were in about the same position; one had 2,500 and the other 2,300. The United States, at that, had an advantage in nuclear warheads. It had about 10,000 of them. As the London Institute of Strategic Studies admits in a recent report, the situation has not changed since then.

What is the aim, then, of the new statements of the U.S. leaders about their country being allegedly behind the Soviet Union in the military field, about the growth of some Soviet military threat? Official Washington, as the American Senator Edward Kennedy says, seeks a pretext for whipping up the arms race. The aim of President Reagan's nuclear program for the 1980's as his chief adviser Edwin Meese explains, is to restore the U.S. strategic supremacy over the Soviet Union within 10 years. The latest proposals of the head of the Washington administration on so-called reduction in strategic nuclear armaments are meant to attain the same ends through the back door. As he put it, the American President sees the purpose of talks in the 1980's ensuring a genuine and long-term reduction of the Soviet Union's military program. Naturally, he does not feel that the United States should assume similar commitments.

As many political figures agree, the (?speech) rhetoric of the President, his unsubstantiated statements about the growth of the Soviet military threat, are designed to mislead public opinion, to create more favorable conditions for implementing the old U.S. plans of attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. These plans are unrealistic and they only enhance the threat of a nuclear war.

FRG TV INTERVIEWS USSR'S ARBATOV ON DISARMAMENT

DW141047 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2030 GMT 13 May 82

["Excerpts" from correspondent Harald Brandt interview with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Moscow United States of America Institute, in Moscow; date not given; answers in Russian with superimposed German translation -- videotaped]

[Text] [Question] What do you think the Americans really want? Do they intend to arms-race the Soviet Union to death or do they intend to conduct military blackmail?

[Answer] In our long and difficult history we have grown used to remaining rather calm in the face of invectives directed at us by our partners or adversaries. History did not begin with Reagan, and he will not be the last one in history, I hope. We also see other Americans and hear different voices among the allies as well. I believe that we have every reason to hope that the world will yet reach a sensible solution and will not commit suicide.

[Question] Do you believe that it is possible at all to attain long-term agreements with the current U.S. administration?

[Answer] Some people change, some go away -- or are asked to go away. They don't last forever. With still others it is impossible indeed to cooperate. This may be an obstacle, and it is one. It is not Reagan's fault alone. A large group of extremists came into the U.S. administration with him. All of them are on the far right; they are extremely obtuse and know nothing of politics. I can imagine the difficulties facing the experienced West European governments which must pretend that they are seriously listening to their older partner and which have to endure these blunders and naive acts because they know what would happen to them politically if they didn't.

[Question] On what specifically do you place your hopes in the existing situation? What are the hopes of Soviet political circles at the moment with respect to the USSR's relations with the United States?

[Answer] To begin with, we promote policies not just with the United States, and the Americans shouldn't think that it spells the end of our policies if they turn their back on us. We existed without diplomatic relations with the United States for 16 years. I do not wish to return to this situation, but people must not believe that the Soviet Union will shed bitter tears when a President comes along and plays the role of a cowboy in the relations with the Soviet Union.

The problem is that the contemporary Americans simply are unwilling -- they don't want disarmament or arms control, or any kind of cooperation. I don't know what they want. They want to increase their weapons. With their dreams they are firmly in the past. They would like to gain control over their allies again, they would like to force us to our knees and they also would like to dominate the Third World. Economically they are oriented toward the 19th century, and politically toward the postwar era when America dreamed that the American era had come.

However, this applies to only a small number of Americans. I believe in the American's commonsense, just as I believe that there are people in the United States who understand that we are forced to live in a world of realities and not one of dreams.

COMMENTARY ON U.S. NUCLEAR TESTING POSITION

LD142014 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] According to an Associated Press report from Washington, the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Eugene Rostow, said on Thursday that some officials in the Reagan administration are trying to keep the way clear for a possible resumption of high-yield nuclear test explosions. Mr Rostow declined to say who these people were. Our observer Igor Dmitriyev makes this comment.

Appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Eugene Rostow made the statements as he tried to explain why the Reagan administration had not announced support for ratification of two test ban treaties. One of them is the threshold test ban treaty of July 1974 and the peaceful nuclear explosion treaty of May 1976. Both were signed with the Soviet Union and dealt with certain limits on explosion yields. Thus the 1974 treaty set a limit of 150 kilotons. In trying to get a decision in favor of the treaties in the Reagan administration, Mr Rostow had run into a profound stone wall. There is a feeling in many parts of the government, he said, that given the uncertainties of the nuclear situation and the need for new weapons and modernization we are going to need testing and perhaps even testing above the 150 kiloton limit. There is no reason not to believe that Eugene Rostow was saying the truth. But the need for new powerful weapons, felt in many parts of the American government, does not square with the President's speech at Eureka College last Sunday, in which proposed cuts in Soviet and American strategic arsenals.

The President's arms reduction proposal is such that it allows the United States to proceed with its strategic arms buildup while at the same time requires considerable reductions in Soviet land-based missiles. That is why, perhaps, American government officials have no good feelings for the two test ban treaties and study the possibility of going above the agreed yield limits specified by them.

These treaties block the testing of powerful warheads for those strategic weapons that the United States feels free to develop and build. If the President's proposal were just fair, if it reflected the administration's genuine concern about the nuclear arms race, if it were built on the principle of equality and like security, as the Soviet Union insists it should, there would hardly be a profound stonewall in many parts of the government to the nation's political commitments.

PAPER ATTACKS REAGAN 'NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL'

PM141235 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 May 82 p 3

[Viktor Svetovidov "Publicist's Reflections": "Imperial Ailment"]

[Text] Listening to the Voice of America today, people everywhere are asking themselves what has become (or will yet become?) of the "new beginning" proclaimed by the Reagan administration. That is not an idle question. A great deal depends on where the United States goes, how and why. Not everything, fortunately, but a great deal. If you carefully watch contradictory American everyday reality, there are far more answers to the question -- comprehensive and partial, laying claim to objectivity or overtly subjective -- than you need to find out the truth. The truth? The very concept has now become suspicious and somehow ambiguous there.

The problems is not even the "department of truth", as people now ironically dub the International Communication Agency, which circulates all over the world bucolic disinformation about Washington's domestic and foreign policy which bears the stamp "truth". The problem, not to say tragedy, of the fact that lies, which will out, have become its creed.

President Reagan misses no opportunity to recall that he used to be not only an actor but a journalist and only after this entered politics. "It's not impossible," James Reston remarked, "that in the very near future he is going to ask himself: Why exactly did I do that?" The patriarch of American bourgeois journalism did not come up with his disrespectful hypothesis merely for the sake of effect. He notes that the President "is currently very unhappy with television and the press. This is not surprising, for they are stubbornly continuing to report what he says, and this often harms his cause more than his opponents' remarks about him."

It is said that once upon a time there was a Chinese emperor who would drag the court astrologer about by the pigtail most painfully every time he told him the days were drawing in. The American mass media are far from possessing the objectivity of the conscientious but unfortunate astrologer. And they are not to blame for the fact that the President's rhetoric and rosy talk of the radiant future that inevitably awaits America crumble into dust when they come into contact with reality.

Around a century and a half ago A. Hertsen said: "Philistinism is the final word of a civilization based on absolute autocracy of ownership." Reagan's "new beginning" is merely that selfsame "final word." It is already swiftly increasing the number of unemployed. There is less and less free soup for them.... The material and therefore spiritual unfreedom of the people dreaming of dinner or even a piece of bread guarantees that the dinner-eaters who elected Reagan as their leader and autocrat will be able to guzzle without hindrance.

But in the end, you may say, this is none of our business. However, America lives not in a vacuum, but in the world. And it is our world, too, not just America's, though Reagan's America doesn't know that. It still thinks that leadership in the capitalist world gives it a perpetual license to hunt on others' land and the right of imperial diktat vis-a-vis all mankind. "Our sacred flame of liberty is a beacon for everyone in the world, a beacon shining forth to them from this good, green and pleasant land called America." So says Ronald Reagan. But whichever country you look at, people nowadays are increasingly convinced that the "good, green and pleasant" land is bringing them not the light of its beacon, long extinguished, but the darkness of oppression, the gloom of deprivation of rights, the night of hopelessness.

Perhaps Reagan is sincere when he says he is worried by the "issue of whether the great ideas of civilized society, the ideas of human freedom, representative government and law and order, will perish or survive"? His treasury secretary probably did not blush when he said "we have brought light where darkness reigned before, warmth where there had been only cold, medicine where disease had flourished, food where there had been hunger, prosperity where man had been languishing in poverty"? Indeed, as Tartuffe said, "We can expand the conscience when it gets too tight...." The light of the civilized society? Napalm in Vietnam. Medicines? The secretary must be aware that the United States, which observes the most rigorous sanitary norms when it is receiving imported goods, exports, for instance, children's pajamas finished with carcinogenic substances. He must be aware that mosquitoes carrying a lethal virus raised by American specialists in Pakistan are generously delivered to Cuba. Prosperity? What about Haiti, Guatemala, El Salvador?...

The world has long since come to its senses and does not want to suffer with the imperial organism, stricken with an incurable ailment.

So much the worse for the world! decides America, grabbing an aspergillum with one hand and chanting "out, out:" and a nuclear sword with the other. The alliance of the sword and aspergillum, which emerged back in the era of the Crusades, militarism shielding itself with the name of God, has brought the peoples much trouble.

R. (Shier), a journalist on the Los Angeles TIMES, recently recalled that when he interviewed Reagan the presidential candidate, he said: "The problem is that the Russians are monsters, that they feel no respect for human life the way we do, and so they can tolerate losing 20, 30 or 40 million people." That's what he said without batting an eyelid. And when he got into the White House, he began acting according to that concept. The final refusal to ratify and implement the SALT II treaty signed by his predecessor; the decision of full-scale production of the neutron bomb; the faster buildup of chemical weapons potential; the overt militarization of space research and experiments; unprecedented pressure on the West European NATO partners to deploy medium-range nuclear weapons.... Those are not all the milestones but they are the most significant in the activity of a President who proceeds from the premise that the world contains no monsters more terrible than the Russians, who have nothing to lose, and assures his compatriots that those damned Russians are on the point of attacking America to destroy its supercivilization.

The old doctrine of "mutual assured destruction" is not enough for the President. His banner now proclaims America's sacred right to deliver a first strike. Against the Soviet Union, of course. For what purpose and reason? Because "the Russians' great superiority enables them to withstand our realiatory strike and to deliver another strike against us." So they must be attacked with all America's might in good time. The USSR has pledged not to deliver a first nuclear strike? So what? Who's going to believe it? But it says it wants to live and let live. It'll say anything. The Russians cannot be believed. I refuse to believe them.

That is the troglodytic intellectual level on which all policy and all strategy in the nuclear missile age is built. The other day Robert McNamera, who in his time was in on the beginning of the doctrine of "mutual assured destruction" and has come to realize a great deal since them, easily and graphically demonstrated what a terrible miscalculation Washington is now being guided by. "The Russians are not madmen," he said. "They know what human losses are like and their government regards itself as responsible to the people for avoiding similar situations in the future. They are far more aware than we are of the impact that such losses may have on their people."

NcNamara and with him all Americans who have not lost their sense of reality are also aware of that. But the President and his entourage are not, for they want to see what does not exist and cannot be.

All because they are carried away with the supertask of bringing the world to its knees before the United States. Nuclear blackmail is regarded as a multipurpose means of pursuing a global imperial policy. "It's no use pressing for steps such as the rejection of the first use of nuclear weapons," Joseph Kraft cynically explained in the Washington POST the other day, "because that would weaken the administration's ability to negotiate in crisis situations -- for instance, like those now being seen in the Near East and the Falkland Islands." "Negotiate" means impose decisions that please and benefit imperialism alone by brandishing the nuclear big stick.

Today the nuclear blackmail is directed primarily against West Europe. In order to upset in its own favor the balance of strategic forces that exists today, the United States is strongarming the governments of the European NATO countries, blackmailing them with the "Russian nuclear danger" and forcing them to accept on their soil American medium-range weapons targeted on the Soviet Union.

Advocating "global deterrence," one of Reagan's closest advisers, Richard Pipes, smirkingly alludes to a precedent that impresses him: "Hitler succeeded because he was regarded as strong and bold."

Do people over there in that "good, green and pleasant land" remember how Hitler ended up? Has it not occurred to them that a policy of "global deterrence" and of teetering on the narrow brink of nuclear disaster is a sign not of strength and boldness but of moral impotence and criminal political irresponsibility?

By usurping the right to execute or pardon mankind, the United States has evoked all over the world, and now at home as well, a storm of anger and condemnation that it did not expect. Is there a way out of the blind impasse for the country? There is, and it is certainly not hard to see it. All you need to do is not to stubbornly turn your back on it. The way out is to decide that not a nuclear arms race, but talks with the Soviet Union on all the problems of military confrontation will save the planet from a nightmare such as has never been seen before. Surely it is time it was realized at last that he who has raised the nuclear sword will perish by it!

MATERIALS ON DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE IN JAPAN

Zatsepin, Kuchko Report

LD141648 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 14 May 82

[By TASS correspondents Viktor Zatsepin and Vladimir Kuchko]

[Text] Tokyo, 14 May, TASS -- Topical problems of curbing the threats of nuclear war, of ending the arms race and consolidating international security are discussed by participants in the international conference against nuclear weapons, for disarmament and nuclear-free zones. The conference opened here today. It was organized on the initiative of the Socialist Party of Japan. Taking part in the conference are representatives of political parties, democratic movements and public organizations of 17 countries, including the Soviet Union, GDR, DPRK, Mongolia, Britain, France, FRG, Japan.

A CPSU delegation consisting of member of the CPSU Central Committee, Chief of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee Yevgeniy Tyazhelnikov and Deputy Chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee Ivan Kovalenko takes part in the conference.

Opening the conference, the Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan Ichio Asukata said: "Despite the striving of peoples for peace, the escalation of the arms race continues now and the danger of thermonuclear war constituting a real threat for humanity is heightening. We must pool the efforts and take concrete steps toward nuclear disarmament."

The leader of the Socialist Party of Japan said that of great importance for the easing of international tension is the creation of nuclear-free zones in different areas of the world, the conclusion of international agreements on renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons. Pointing to serious danger of Washington's notorious doctrine about the possibility of a "limited" nuclear war, Ichio Asukato made a call for pressing for the abrogation of the plans of the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons, for reduction and subsequent liquidation of these weapons, emphasized the need of banning the production of the neutron bomb, of chemical, biological and other types of mass destruction weapons.

Chairman of the Hiroshima Council of the Organizations of Victims of Atomic Bombings Professor I. Moritaki made an ardent call for preventing the repetition of the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He told the participants in the conference about the horrible consequences of that barbarous crime of the United States.

"The Soviet Union regards as the priority task that of upholding peace, averting the threat of nuclear war, curbing the arms race. Precisely these aims are served by the Soviet peace programme for the eighties that was advanced by the 26th CPSU Congress," Yevgeniy Tyazhelnikov said in his speech. He pointed out that the Soviet Union presses consistently for the liquidation of nuclear weapons and bears up its peace proposals by practical deeds.

The Soviet representative pointed to the Soviet Union's concrete steps aimed at ridding mankind of nuclear catastrophe, at ending the nuclear arms race and consolidating international security. The new Soviet initiatives include such initiatives that have a direct bearing on Japan. The Soviet Union, as Leonid Brezhnev stressed, sees no obstacles to opening talks with Japan on concluding an agreement on non-use of nuclear weapons, if Japan keeps from production and acquisition of such weapons and will not have them on its territory.

The Soviet representative pointed to the important role in the lessening of the threat of thermonuclear war that the creation of nuclear-free zones in different areas of the world could play. He emphasized that the creation of such zones presents a real opportunity also for non-nuclear countries to contribute to the cause of disarmament, relaxation of international tension.

The Soviet Union attaches a serious importance to the coming second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament and will do everything within its power so that the session should concentrate its attention on achieving concrete results in this sphere, Yevgeniy Tyazhelnikov said. The Soviet Union is prepared for broad and constructive cooperation with countries of the other social system, with everybody who is prepared to work sincerely for the sake of durable, just and democratic peace.

Tyazhelnikov Address

OW150755 Moscow In Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] A conference against nuclear weapons and for disarmament and the establishment of nuclear-free zones opened in Tokyo on 14 May. Moscow radio's Tokyo correspondent Vladimir Tsvetov filed the following report on this conference:

In response to a call by the Japan Socialist Party [JSP], delegations from 15 countries including the Soviet Union, East Germany, North Korea and Mongolia are attending this meeting. The senior Soviet delegate is Yevgeni Tyazhelnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Also present are delegations of the socialist and labor parties of Australia, France, Sweden, West Germany, New Zealand and Great Britain, as well as delegations from Pacific countries. China refused to send a delegation.

In the opening speech, Ichio Asukata, chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee, said: Dangers of a nuclear war have increased in Asia and the Pacific region in recent years. This makes it imperative to step up the struggle for banning nuclear weapons and achieving disarmament, as well as the struggle for the establishment of nuclear-free zones, which is of particular importance to Asia. This conference, the first of its kind dedicated to these objectives, will mark the beginning of a movement aimed at these goals.

The 14 May session was also addressed by senior Soviet delegate Yevgeniy Tyazhelnikov. The following is a summary of his speech:

We are gathered here in a country which was the first to learn what a nuclear war is about. The tragedies at Hiroshima and Nagasaki still remain an indelible anguish for all mankind.

We are holding this meeting at a time when the international situation has become remarkably serious. Threats to peace posed by the imperialist aggressive militarists are mounting. The United States is pressing its NATO allies and Japan to increase their military spendings year after year. The top echelons of the United States are not even concealing the fact that these war expenses are aimed at socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union.

In 1978 the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact member countries proposed to halt the production of nuclear arms of all types, to gradually reduce their stock and to pave the way for their complete abolition.

At the first special assembly on disarmament and later at its regular sessions in 1978 and 1979, the UN General Assembly expressed its approval of this Soviet proposal.

The head of the Soviet delegation then stressed the weighty significance of the forthcoming second UN special assembly on disarmament to peace and the security of nations. He added: The Soviet Union has always taken concrete measures to substantiate its proposals. Thanks to Soviet proposals, important international agreements have been concluded -- the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, space and under water and the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, for example. At the proposal of the Soviet Union, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the nonuse of armed force and a permanent ban on the use of nuclear arms.

In 1979, after protracted and strenuous efforts, the Soviet Union and the United States signed the Second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT II. The world breathed relief. However, SALT II has not yet been put in force. The United States is reponsible for this.

In 1978 the Soviet Union declared that it would absolutely not use nuclear arms against those countries which refuse to produce, acquire or deploy nuclear arms in their territories. On the basis of this the Soviet Union proposed that an international treaty on strengthening the security of nonnuclear countries be concluded. The Soviet Union proposed that talks be held on banning the introduction of nuclear arms into countries where no nuclear arms are deployed. More than 100 countries agreed to this proposal. Those which opposed this proposal were only the United States, its NATO and ANZUS treaty allies and Japan.

Furthermore, the 36th UN General Assembly adopted a Soviet-proposed declaration on preventing nuclear war. The declaration solemnly declared that preemptive use of nuclear arms is the worst crime against mankind. Again at that time, the United States and Japan and other pro-U.S. military-political allies did not support this resolution.

Nonnuclear zones will play an important role in reducing the threat of a hot nuclear war. The establishment of nonnuclear zones should be based on one hand on the limitation that nuclear arms will not be produced, acquired or introduced, and on the other hand on the nuclear countries' commitment not to use nuclear arms against any countries in a nonnuclear zone and to respect and not to infringe upon the status of nuclear zones. If Japan guarantees that it will not produce, acquire or introduce nuclear arms, the Soviet Union is ready to start talks with it on concluding an agreement on the nonuse of nuclear arms without waiting for the establishment of a nuclear zone in the Far East, Yevgeniy Tyazhelnikov said.

The Tokyo international conference will continue its work on 15 May.

TYAZHELNIKOV INTERVIEWED ON ARMS, OTHER ISSUES

OW161059 Tokyo KYODO in English 1031 GMT 15 May 82

[Text] Tokyo, May 15, KYODO -- A Soviet Communist Party leader said here Saturday Moscow will soon offer a proposal on strategic nuclear arms reduction in preparation for a Soviet-proposed U.S.-Soviet summit.

Y.M. Tyazhelnikov, director of the Propaganda Section of the Party's Central Committee, made the statement in an interview with KYODO news service. I.I. Kovalenko, deputy director of the committee's International Section and vice president of the Soviet-Japan Association, was also present.

The two officials are here as delegates to a Japan Socialist Party-sponsored international forum on nuclear weapons and disarmament.

Tyazhelnikov criticized U.S. President Ronald Reagan's recent proposal for a staged reduction in American and Soviet nuclear weapons as a ploy to maintain the U.S. military advantage over the Soviet Union. He said Reagan made the proposal "under the pressure of world opinion to talk with the Soviet Union on the issue" and described the U.S. President's "peace-loving words" as a pose.

However, he said the Soviet Union is serious about reaching a rational agreement with the United States on strategic arms reduction.

Referring to Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev's proposal for a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Helsinki or Geneva this October, he said the Soviet Union will soon make "a concrete and realistic proposal on strategic arms limitation and reduction" for solving the issue step by step.

He did not elaborate on when and how the Soviet Union would make the proposal.

Tyazhelnikov termed the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT II) pact signed in June 1979 "balanced," suggesting the new proposal will be based on the older plan.

Responding to questions on Brezhnev's health, he said the president was in good health and working hard.

He said there is no need to consider Brezhnev's successor at the present time, and denied there would be a reshuffle of the party leadership at a general meeting of the party Central Committee later this month.

As to Soviet-China relations, Tyazhelnikov said Beijing has failed to respond positively to Brezhnev's March proposal for improving relations. However, he said there is an objective basis for better ties, citing recent activity in trade, scientific, cultural and sports exchanges between the two countries.

Speaking on the Polish situation, he said martial law had delivered "a crushing blow to enemies of socialism" but added that the East European country still needs "much time" to solve its political, economic and ideological troubles.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD161744 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 16 May 82

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, international affairs journalist; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, all-union radio foreign political affairs commentator]

Movements Against Nuclear War

[Text] [Levin] Good day, esteemed comrade listeners. The increasingly deep understanding of the threat of nuclear war spreading among the masses has become a most important feature of contemporary international affairs. This awareness is indeed assuming special characteristics. It is manifesting itself in a whole series of events having a substantial influence on people's minds and, we may safely say, on the policy of many states. There has been a sharp exacerbation of the contemporary international situation, for which imperialism is to blame. This is a well-known truth. The Soviet Union has repeatedly spoken of it. But it is important to stress that broadest circles of public opinion in the capitalist countries are now also becoming aware of this truth.

This awareness of a threat, which is becoming increasingly dangerous, was reflected in events held during the week of action for security and cooperation in Europe. The mass demonstrations and marches in defense of peace, in support of the peace-loving initiatives of the Soviet Union, which took place in the Soviet Union and the other states of the socialist community, were a characteristic feature of this week.

[Shishlin] Incidentally the World Conference of Religious Workers in Defense of the Sacred Gift of Life From the Threat of Nuclear Disaster has also been held in Moscow. It was a noteworthy event.

[Levin] It was a very noteworthy and very important event. A mass action for peace by people involved in the arts was held in West Berlin; 20,000 people took part in it. In New York 5,000 women attended a demonstration in support of peace on Mother's Day. The national conference of the Australian Peace Committee was held. It adopted a declaration stressing that the main task is to create a broad movement against the nuclear threat.

In this respect I would like to note that the peace-loving initiatives of the Soviet Union are receiving very broad support during these actions and demonstrations. This applies particularly to the proposals made by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev 2 months ago at the Soviet trade union congress, where he spoke of the need to halt the nuclear arms race, where he spoke of the Soviet Union's actions aimed at limiting medium-range nuclear armaments, and where he particularly emphasized the need to resume the process of limiting strategic armaments as soon as possible.

This voice of public opinion is now so loud that even those who are maybe not very keen to hear it cannot fail to do so. We can now say quite confidently that the voice of public opinion is also reaching the White House.

Reagan's Latest Speech

[Bovin] Yes. In this respect Reagan's latest speech is rather intriguing. It has been actively discussed in the world press. Our press has written about it. It was a very intriguing speech. It was very contradictory. But the most striking thing is this: If you compare the things that Reagan is saying now with what he said on the eve of his election or in the first months after his election, you can see that in general great changes have taken place in his vocabulary.

I will quote some extracts; this is what he said: For our partnership -- in other words, the partnership of the Western powers -- there is one most important question which will form the backdrop to all my discussions with all the European leaders. This is the future of relations between the West and the Soviet Union.

He goes on to say: Our task is to determine the framework in which there can be a durable and healthy relationship between East and West. He also says: I hope that we will be able to build a more constructive relationship with the Soviet Union. He goes on to express support for dialogue, as he calls it, for disarmament and so on and so forth. Generally speaking, these are all things which a year ago, for example, it would simply have been difficult to hear coming from Reagan's lips. He did not say these things then.

[Levin] He said completely different things.

[Bovin] Completely different things. It is precisely that pressure from world public opinion about which you spoke on the one hand and the positive initiatives of the Soviet Union, on the other hand, which are forcing even such people as Reagan to change their tune in this way.

Unfortunately, however, all these positive-sounding elements end at the level of very general statements. Whenever he moves on to more specific matters then regrettably it is the same Reagan once again, on the whole. For instance, he talks of constructive relations with the Soviet Union and then begins to repeat mainly all those notions of his concerning the Soviet Union to which we have already become accustomed: The Soviet Union is to blame for what is happening in Central America; the Soviet Union is to blame for what is happening in Africa; the Soviet Union is to blame for virtually all the scrapes in which mankind becomes involved. In Reagan's view everywhere and over everything there hovers the sinister shadow of the Soviet Union.

[Shishlin] We may add that the premise for building new constructive relations with the Soviet Union is always the preservation of the inviolability of the line adopted by Reagan and his present administration toward achieving military superiority.

[Bovin] Yes, what happens is this: Reagan appears to stand for good relations with the Soviet Union but only on condition that the Soviet Union's conduct in the international arena should satisfy the standards, criteria and evaluations put forward by Reagan himself. Well, as you will all understand, comrades, this cannot be a serious dialogue with the Soviet Union. Each state has its own interests to look after on the international scene and one must learn to respect these interests; one must learn to take these interests into account and find some acceptable compromise solutions, rather than consider one's own behavior to be good and the behavior of everyone else to be automatically bad. And Reagan is trying to precisely use such tricks as the basis of his policies toward the Soviet Union. This, of course, is completely unwise.

[Levin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, I would like to confirm your argument by quoting concrete statements made by prominent American politicians. For example, Roger (Molender), former nuclear arms expert at the National Security Council, said Reagan's plan demands that the Russians restructure their nuclear arsenals to suit the American criteria. The criticism about Reagan's statements in Eureka was so strong that at his latest press conference on Thursday, he attempted to answer these criticisms, trying to give the impression that, as he said, he was not understood correctly on all issues.

Reagan Press Talk, SALT-II

One must say immediately that this press conference by no means dispersed the gloom created by the statements put forward in Eureka. Most clearly this became evident not in the President's statements but in his answers to questions. For instance, one direct question at the press conference was: Wouldn't it be better for a start to ratify the SALT-II treaty which was signed in 1979 in Vienna by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States?

[Bovin] In America now they quite often refer back to this treaty and quite loudly, increasingly loudly, voices are raised saying that it would be advantageous, after all, to ratify this treaty.

[Shishlin] But here there are, if you like, two very prominent features -- in Reagan's speech and the entire situation concerning strategic arms talks. There has been some progress in the U.S. position despite everything. Earlier, they were not prepared to hold talks on this matter, they were delaying their resumption; and now they are even proposing a concrete time schedule, and generally express a readiness to resume negotiations. This is already something, this is already something. However, the problem of course is still in the content, the "baggage" which the sides can bring to the talks.

[Bovin] One American journalist said that Reagan is proposing to the Soviets to exchange the present for the future. This is, for example, the implication about is us Europe -- we should disarm now in the hope that the Americans after that will not arm themselves. This is the logic of it, in essence.

[Shishlin] Yes, and here our approach, generally speaking, the approach of the Soviet Union really is of course an approach which takes not just Soviet interests into account but the interests of international security as a whole. We really do believe that the paramount problem is the limitation and curtailment of the nuclear arms race, and our position, which is based on the belief that one must tackle both strategic armaments, and medium-range missiles, and, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has said, tactical nuclear weapons, too, really does present an approach which is dictated by the realities of our nuclear age, the realities of the present alarming situation in which it is simply a matter of vital necessity both for each country and for mankind as a whole to begin pulling back from that dangerous point at which we are beginning to arrive in connection with the sharp growth of tension and with this terrible and dangerous logic of enmity, mistrust and suspicion -- the logic of fear, if you like.

[Levin] To return to Reagan's press conference, I should like to note that in answer to a question about whether it would not be better to ratify the SALT-II treaty, he said that no, SALT-II had been the wrong line to take. Speaking to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 2 days earlier, Haig said that SALT-II was a dead treaty: "We shall not return to it" and "everything has to be started completely afresh and differently."

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, it seems to me, all the same, that despite the fact that statements such as this really are being made, in their comments both Reagan and Haig do not reject the SALT-II treaty 100 percent. I think the idea that the SALT-II treaty did contain things which are quite acceptable to the United States is not wholly alien even to the present administration. But since the SALT-II treaty really was based on strict observance of the principle of equal security by both sides based on the principle of parity, and the Reagan administration would like to upset this parity in the U.S. favor, this does not suit them and that is another matter.

[Levin] As it happens, the 10th anniversary of the signing of two agreements which were called SALT-I happens in a few days time -- the treaty on the limitation of anti-missile defense systems, and the provisional agreement on certain limitations to strategic armaments. These agreements were the first step reached precisely on the basis of a recognition of the principle of equality. The Reagan administration just does not want to recognize this principle. Take any problem confronting the world -- we see this desire on the part of the United States to outdo the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe are resuming in Vienna. The 27th round is beginning. Talks have been under way for over 8 years. And how is the new round beginning? The proposal presented by the socialist countries at the preceding round, a proposal which in large measure met the previously expressed position of the Western powers, is rejected. And on what basis? Admit that you have a superiority which does not exist, then we can proceed! Take literally any problem, and you will see that the United States is everywhere attempting to foist its own point of view, and reality is forcing amendments to be made, but that desire is present.

The recent visit to Beijing by U.S. Vice President Bush merits attention, to my mind, in this regard.

Bush PRC Visit

[Shishlin] It was, of course, an interesting visit. Bush also toured some other countries in the region. But, no doubt, Beijing was the culmination of his trip.

[Bovin] The main problem is Taiwan, that timebomb, as they call it, and in this respect neither the position of the Chinese nor the position of the Americans changed, as far as I can see.

[Shishlin] Generally speaking, there were evasive phrases to the effect that at Bush's meetings with senior Chinese officials important questions of some kind, requiring study, as Bush said, were put forward, and he is to inform the President about them, but it appears that the differences between the United States and China have not been eliminated by this visit; they remain. But, on the other hand, the visit itself nevertheless shows the interest of the present Chinese leaders in maintaining such active relations with the United States.

[Bovin] The Americans, of course, also have an interest in this. But the attitude of each side is based on its own interests. I think they now have one common interest. This is the anti-Soviet course. But the Taiwan problem does of course exist. And there are other problems as well. It will be rather difficult to find some compromise which will eliminate these elements of tension in relations between China and the United States. In this respect, I repeat, Bush's visit did not in my view advance matters at all.

[Shishlin] This is all the more so in that this entire Californian group from which the present U.S. administration emerged has very strong, traditional links with Taiwan, very extensive economic ties. The products manufactured in the southern United States and California are to a considerable extent military products.

[Levin] But I get the impression that, at least when it first took office, the Reagan administration assumed that in view of the position which the Chinese leaders had put themselves in they would swallow any pill prepared for them by Washington. It assumed that they would reconcile themselves to the fact that the administration would develop relations with Taiwan, perhaps at a slightly higher level even than the previous administration.

[Shishlin] In general the Chinese are putting up with it, strictly speaking.

[Levin] Indeed. Take the basis of their relations. This was, incidentally, stressed in the messages from President Reagan to the three Chinese leaders which were conveyed by Bush. These messages contained a call for the expansion of strategic cooperation between Washington and Beijing against the Soviet Union. It is on this basis that U.S. Chinese relations are being built.

Middle East Situation

This aspiration to pursue a policy which does not consider the interests of peace and security is also manifested in the Near East. Fairbanks is on a mission there now. The aim of his mission is to bring about a resumption...

[Bovin] The situation there is very confused and uncertain following all that business in the Sinai. Thus, by all accounts, a new round in the game is starting. This applies especially to Egypt, which, it seems to me, will evidently make some adjustments in its policy now, although Mubarak goes out of his way to say that the Camp David framework will still be good. But the gulf that exists between the positions of Israel and Egypt cannot be covered by any formulations. This is because, in spite of everything, Egypt believes that talks with the Israelis on autonomy should at least outline the path to the formation of an independent Palestinian state. For Tel Aviv, of course, such a prospect is absolutely unthinkable. It will do anything to stop this happening. This gulf, this difference in positions cannot be concealed by any diplomatic formulae although there is a possibility talks will start. But the question is "where." Israel says in Jerusalem. Egypt, of course, rejects this.

But it is interesting that the Americans seem to be playing a rather passive role in Near East affairs at the moment. Many observers have noticed this. At any rate one might expect them to be more active, as they were, for example, during the preparation of the Camp David agreement and just after it. But now the Americans are far less active there. Evidently this is related to a whole number of reasons, to the difficulties which Reagan is having in his relations with Israel and to the failure, basically, of U.S. attempts to establish some kind of anti-Soviet strategic consensus out of the moderate Arab states and Israel. It is also related to the fact that the Americans themselves, I am sure, realize that Camp David is a failure and that the talks on Palestinian autonomy will not be at all successful. So, U.S. policy on the Near East is also going through an uncertain phase at the moment. This is all the more so in that Iran and Iraq are still at war with each other. It is very difficult for the United States to judge where its interests lie, to decide whether it would prefer an Iranian victory, an Iraqi victory or some kind of draw, so to speak. So, in view of all these factors one feels that the Americans are playing a passive role in the Near East.

[Shishlin] But in addition to this there is, of course, the provocative position of Israel itself, which...

[Bovin] ...is much more active.

[Shishlin] Israel is really behaving in a completely unequivocal manner. Israel's actions -- its constant sallies against Lebanon, against the Palestinian liberation forces -- have quite simply become a permanent element in the entire Near East situation. Unfortunately the situation in this zone is of course becoming more inflammatory.

[Levin] The American Washington POST recently said, in an analysis of the situation in the Near East, that Begin's government, from all appearances, is firmly decided on establishing control over all of Jerusalem and the occupied West Bank territories, even if that means raids into Lebanon.

It seems this is a polite way of clouding the real state of affairs. In reality Begin's government has embarked on an open course of annexation and strengthening its grip on the seized territories and this is creating enormous tension in the Near East.

[Bovin] Begin would say: "How can there be any question of annexation? You can only annex land belonging to someone else, but this land is ours. So there is no annexation here." There you have Tel Aviv's logic. And with logic like that, of course, there just cannot be any successful talks.

[Levin] Naturally, this kind of logic creates many problems for the United States.

[Bovin] No doubt, since they have to somehow balance and adjust their policies, and have some sort of decent relations with the Arabs, and with Israel; and as a result what happens is, so to speak, a vicious circle for them which they cannot escape from, in essence.

Falklands Issue

[Levin] The only consolation for the Americans now may be that they find themselves at present facing an even more insoluble problem in connection with the Anglo-Argentine conflict around the Falklands.

[Bovin] Here the Americans really have a headache. They have a headache because on the one hand, well, clearly all assess the present situation as above all, no one knows yet who will lose, Argentina or Britain; but the Americans have clearly lost, have clearly suffered a major diplomatic defeat. On the one hand Haig's mission failed and the Americans were shown up not to be in a position to influence either their allies or their Latin American "clients," so to speak. On the other hand, after eventually taking Britain's side, with considerable delay, the Americans brought about a sharp deterioration in their relations with Latin America.

There were even voices saying it is necessary to review this treaty, the inter-American treaty, and create a new Latin American system which would not include the United States any more.

[Shishlin] And move the headquarters of the OAS from the United States.

[Bovin] Well, comrades, you are no doubt following the course of military action there day by day, so we will not talk about that here. But there are some interesting reflections that come to mind in connection with this war. You see, this is one of a number of wars which are being waged without being formally declared.

In the past when a war began, the custom was for a declaration to be made that the countries in question were in a state of war. Just look — Iran-Iraq, and now Argentina, a real war is going on, but officially it is not war. Britain has not declared war on Argentina, Argentina has not declared war on Britain, and diplomatic relations still exist formally [as heard] and yet hostilities are underway. And this is quite characteristic of many local wars of recent times.

On the other hand, something else that is also very characteristic when you consider this conflict is the force of nationalism today because from the point of view of the major interests of the states of Britain and Argentina, these Falkland Islands should not from any point of view become the cause of a war in which people get killed, ships get sunk and aircraft are shot down. And yet we have this patriotic hullabaloo in Britain, and a patriotic hullabaloo in Argentina. And there it is, all...

[Shishlin] ...a jingoistic hullabaloo!

[Bovin] It is all taking a paradoxical form. And now those leftwing forces which have always waged a struggle against the military regime are in essence in solidarity with it.

In other words, considerations stemming from nationalistic notions are proving stronger than social differences. Another characteristic feature of many of these conflict situations — war situations — which have arisen recently in the postwar period at any rate, is the very major and noticeable part played by nationalistic considerations, to which both economic and even social considerations sometimes yield center stage. That is one of the parameters of this conflict which it is interesting to examine.

[Shishlin] The Soviet Union has an interest in seeing this problem resolved in the spirit of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations concerning the decolonization of the Falkland, or Malvinas, Islands. The Argentine demand is an old one, and the Argentine demand, is by and large, of course, quite understandable, and, if we were to discuss the causes of this sharp outbreak of conflict, they should be sought, no doubt, not just in the events of recent weeks but in what happened several years back and even more than 100 years ago.

[Bovin] Yes, it seems to me there are all sorts of colonial themes, so to speak, in this. But, hostilities are unfortunately nevertheless under way, and the main issue now holding up attempts at a diplomatic settlement of the problem is that of the sovereignty of the islands. If Argentina does not withdraw its main demand, so to speak, that one way or another it has to be recognized now that talks about the islands will lead to the restoration of Argentine sovereignty — that is the Argentine demand. The British are quite categorically refusing to accept this demand.

[Shishlin] The Argentinians are not making the recognition of their sovereignty a precondition for the resumption of talks.

[Bovin] They are saying that (?there should be) a guaranteed restoration for sovereignty as the final result.

[Levin] In his recent interview, President Galtieri of Argentina declared that an agreement must be reached under which "we will not need to wait another 149 years for the restoration of our sovereignty."

[Bovin] Well, there is a diplomatic formula.

[Levin] Yes, that is the formula. But the situation, of course, remains very alarming, and the most alarming aspect is that the issue has entered the sphere of a military solution to the problem, and in this military solution the United States is playing a most active part.

[Shishlin] Well, however thankless a task it is to make forecasts, it seems to me that this military situation is hardly accessible to solution by military methods. One way or another, the parties will have to seek political methods and political means to solve the problem.

Warsaw Pact Policies

[Levin] Political methods of tackling problems are an urgent requirement of our time. But, so far, one is unfortunately compelled to note the U.S. course toward the attainment of military superiority. And for this reason, when we speak of the present day international situation, of recent events, we should no doubt say a few words about a date which was marked this week -- the anniversary of the formation of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

[Shishlin] It would be more correct to talk not so much about the date as the policies of the countries which are party to the Warsaw Treaty. These policies could be described fairly briefly. They are policies of peace, they are aimed at ensuring that peace reigns in Europe and that peace reigns in every corner of the world. And these policies are backed up by absolutely specific, absolutely practical and tangible actions by the participant-states of the Warsaw treaty. We have a strong defense in the event of any possible challenge by imperialism and in the event of any threats, but we want a peace which is not based on a balance of fear, and so the policies of the Warsaw Treaty are policies directed at limiting and curtailing the arms race, at continuing the process of detente and at the radical normalization of the world political atmosphere. And it seems to me that the future belongs to these policies. These policies are an indispensable element in ensuring that the present situation changes for the better.

[Levin] With that, we come to the end of our program, esteemed comrades. All the best and thank you for your attention.

MOSCOW EXAMINES ANGLO-ARGENTINE CONFLICT

LD161744 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 May 82

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by IZVESTIYA political observer Stanislav Kondrashev]

[Text] Good evening, comrades. During the past week, the Anglo-Argentine conflict over the Falkland/Malvinas Islands has received the greatest attention. One Western observer recalled in this connection that it is easier to start a war than to end it.

If you want a fresh example here it is: The Iranian-Iraqi war. It has been going on for almost 2 years. It has gone on for so long that it has been half forgotten by other nations and people not directly involved. But how can those who fight, or those who have buried close relatives forget it? According to some estimates over 100,000 people have died in that war.

The old truth that war is easier to start than to finish is greatly applicable to the crisis in the South Atlantic. During the past week, Britain has continued to close its naval and air pincers around the Falklands, has bombarded them, has sunk Argentine ships, has shot down Argentine aircraft and has threatened invasion by direct assault. London has used the military operations more as means of political pressure on Argentina -- for political blackmail if you like.

Diplomatic activity with the aim of settling the conflict continued all week. There is no shortage of mediators wishing to peacefully separate the sides involved in the conflict. Now the hopes are placed on the complex of ideas which are being offered by UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar.

What are these ideas? According to reports received they include the following elements: An immediate cessation of military operations; the withdrawal of Argentine troops from the islands; the withdrawal of the British fleet from the region; the beginning of talks between the sides in the conflict; the cessation of the economic blockade of Argentina; temporary UN measures envisaging the establishment of UN administration over the Falkland/Malvinas islands with the possible participation of Argentina and Britain.

Perez de Cuellar has had daily, though separate, meetings with the representatives of the two sides, and all week reports from the UN headquarters have showed caution in forecasts and have expressed reserved optimism.

The most acute problem, that of sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, has been placed in Perez de Cuellar's plan for the future -- for later, so to speak. It is thought that it will be solved in an atmosphere of cooled passions, through negotiations and not with bombs, rockets and torpedoes. The Argentine representative agreed with this variant on the condition that Argentine sovereignty over the islands is recognized at the outcome of the negotiations.

The British showed less willingness to agree. It is not superfluous to speak about the lessons, the results of the conflict which can be called preliminary or provisional. Who needs those small islands lost in the southern part of the Atlantic Ocean on the border with Antarctica, with no forests, and which are windswept and uninhabitable for the most part? This question was asked by Swedish traveller and naturalist (Sven Jolseter), who spent several months on the Falklands. He asked the question not in the last century or earlier, but quite recently, at the end of the sixties, in our century. We say South Atlantic, and unwillingly the mind brings up everything connected with the hot word "south". But it is cold and very windy there. The land looks like the tundra and only in places is it protected from constant winds. Stunted bushes grow there; there are fewer than 2,000 inhabitants, and over 600,000 sheep. Most probably there are even more penguins, which are the favorite fare of the sea-lions.

Some time ago in that area of the Atlantic there were more whales than anywhere else, but they have been exterminated. Thinking that the same fate will befall the penguins, naturalist (Julseter) dreamt that "it would be good to make the Falkland Islands into a penguin colony." But they have remained a historic curiousity, a colony of the already vanished British Empire. Removed from the entire world, the islanders switched on their radios which for 15 minutes daily carried sports news and devoted only 10 minutes to political and international news. And now on these islands and around them there are many more Argentine and British soldiers than inhabitants, and the cold deep waters have engulfed hundreds of sailors who perished on one and the other side. The waters are frozen, as the winter is now coming in the Southern Hemisphere.

The radio, television and the newspapers of the entire world waste no time in transmitting news about the development of the conflict in the South Atlantic. And here is the first lesson or conclusion: International life is like a minefield which has not been cleared and explosions sound at times as the echo of history. In the given case we are talking about the history of colonialism, with its vestigal rudiments. The 1.5-month conflict crowns a 1.5-century dispute. In 1833 the former all-powerful master of the seas grabbed this archipelago 12,000 kilometers from its shores. But now even the blind can see that the British have no future there. London ensured the explosion of this mine by delaying its farewell to the past.

The second conclusion concerns the high temperature of the antiwar moods in the present day world. If in the first days of the conflict in that God-forsaken place bystanders followed it like sports fans, now the developing military operations and the first hundreds of victims have moved not only the Argentines and British. The general struggle against further bloodshed is creating a world climate unfavorable for new Marlboroughs [titled English family and forebears of Winston Churchill] to go to battle.

Finally there is another conclusion: It is still premature to speak about victors, but among the victims they list American diplomacy. Having adopted for a short time the pose of disinterested party, Washington soon took the part of London and thus drove against itself practically all the Latin American countries which in the present case show their solidarity with Argentina. Washington's explanations and half-justification sound like this: It is not proper to abandon the United States' most steadfast ally in trouble.

But this is not how the American position was read in Latin America and generally in the nonaligned countries. There they saw one nature, one breed, one policy, colonialist and imperialist. It must be noted that some Western observers are trying to turn this whole affair in another, anti-Soviet direction. For example, the French newspaper LE MONDE notes the contradictions in which American diplomacy got lost, and calls them splendid presents for Moscow. This sounds almost like an accusation against the Soviet Union. It is as though the hand of Moscow had led Washington into the above-mentioned contradictions. London, in the meantime, goes even further. Even at the official level it is ready to seek a cover for its actions along the line of anti-Soviet fabrications. On Friday, the USSR Foreign Ministry statement revealed that the British side several times approached the Soviet side with some kind of warnings, intehded to create the impression that the Soviet Union is somehow associated with the Anglo-Argentine conflict. The USSR Foreign Ministry told the British ambassador that the above-mentioned warnings and appeals are totally unacceptable, as the Soviet Union's behavior does not give them slightest reason, and that the Soviet side views them as provocative.

MOSCOW SCORES WASHINGTON FOR SUPPORTING UK

PY170837 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 0000 GMT 16 May 82

[By Alksander Barisov]

[Text] The conflict over the Falkland/Malvinas issue that led to a military confrontation between Argentina and Great Britain revealed that a serious crisis affects the inter-American sector [words indistinct] U.S. efforts in the Western Hemisphere.

Washington's negative role was again observed. The White House openly supported London and decided to implement military and economic sanctions against Buenos Aires. According to an Argentine memorandum submitted to the OAS, that decision could lead to a real division within the inter-American system.

Inter-American relations are based on the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty, TIAR, signed on Washington's initiative by 20 Latin American republics and the United States in 1947. The basic principles of this Rio de Janeiro treaty became part of the OAS statutes created afterward. The simple essence of the treaty is Article No 3, which says that the countries agree that an armed aggression against any country of the Americas will be considered an aggression against all the countries of the Americas.

The OAS statute called for the economic, social and cultural development of the country members and simultaneously declared this was an organization of common defense. In the Rio Treaty the Washington (?representatives) talked about inter-American solidarity, common destiny and brotherhood recalling the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine, which was proclaimed in 1823, says America for the Americans.

The Rio de Janeiro treaty was put into effect at Washington's request. The treaty was (?implemented) in 1962 [words indistinct] on Cuba, a country which got rid of the chains of U.S. domination, under the pretext that Cuba was an instrument of a foreign power. The Rio de Janeiro treaty was again implemented to put down the popular insurrection against the dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. But Cuba and the national insurrection in the Dominican Republic were never a threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

Such a situation then really did emerge and it seemed that the Rio Treaty ought to be put into operation, since one of the country members was suffering a treacherous military aggression by Great Britan, a non-American power. Under these circumstances Argentina requested an urgent meeting of the Consultative Conference of the OAS foreign ministers. The United States strongly opposed it because when the relations between Washington and one of its main allies of the aggressive front are at stake Washington does not even have time to think about the Monroe Doctrine or the Rio Treaty. However, in view of the fact that more than 2/3 of the votes, (?18) countries, were cast, -- more than the votes needed by the statutes -- the conference was held.

As is well known, the conference participants approved by a large majority a resolution calling Great Britain to immediately stop its hostile activities in the South Atlantic and carry out peaceful negotiations with Argentina. It should be noted that the U.S. representatives tried to remove from the resolution anything that -- according to what they said -- would have been [words indistinct] for Great Britain. The (?United States) did not support the recognition of Argentine sovereignty over the islands then, as was expected, the United States refused to vote for the resolution in support of Argentina.

Why did Washington (?not comply) with the Monroe Doctrine and with the other provisions to defend their brothers [words indistinct] against any aggression? It looks as if it is because at the present time the doctrine does not fit the interests of the U.S. imperialist policies, both at the overall level and in the South Atlantic.

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY SUBMITS PROTEST TO UK

PY150827 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 14 May 82

[Commentary by Valentin Mashkin from "Latin American Events" feature]

[Text] The Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union today made the following statement to United Kingdom Ambassador Herbert Keeble:

The British Government continues to expand the zone of military operations in the Atlantic Ocean, arbitrarily declaring that extensive zones of the high seas are closed to ships and aircraft of other countries. These measures are in outright contradiction of the 1958 Convention of the High Seas, and consequently they are considered to be illegal by the Soviet Union. Moreover, the British, while expanding their belligerent actions in the South Atlantic and implementing a plan for providing diplomatic cover for such actions, have several times addressed warnings to the Soviet Union, warnings which are completely inopportune and intended to disseminate the falsehood of Soviet participation in the Anglo-Argentine conflict over the Falklands or Malvinas Islands. However, the facts prove that the Soviet Union has not given any grounds for such British-fabricated falsehoods, and London knows the facts very well.

The British ambassador was also told that the aforementioned warnings and admonitions on the part of Great Britain are totally unacceptable to the Soviets, who can only consider them as provocative and not conducive to the maintenance of a normal climate in Soviet-British relations.

The British ambassador replied that he would convey this statement of the Foreign Ministry of the Soviet Union to his government.

ZORIN COMMENTARY ON U.S. BUDGET DISPUTE

LD151526 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1857 GMT 13 May 82

[From the "World Today" program, presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] I would like to draw your attention, comrades, to the serious political conflict that is developing in Washington, which I think is attracting less attention than it deserves. In any case this situation has not arisen by chance but is the result of efforts by influential circles in the American capital not to expose dirty linen in public. It is a question of events having a most substantial influence on the political situation in leading circles in the United States today. It is also fraught with serious consequences for the coming months.

I am talking about the serious conflict between the legislative and executive powers in the United States -- namely, the government, led by Reagan, and the Congress, the highest legislative organ. Such clashes between the President and congressmen is not a new feature of American political life, but clashes have not been so acute since the ill-fated Watergate scandal, which you know ended with the expulsion of President Nixon from the White House. Although the clash will not take such extreme form this time, it is now substantially affecting the functioning of the American state mechanism. The reason for the conflict is the question of the Congress approving the draft 1983 federal budget prepared by the President.

American congressmen have studied this draft for many weeks. So far, despite the extreme pressure being exerted on them by the White House, there is no chance at all that they will approve the government's budget proposals. This is leading not only to a political fever in higher government echelons but to substantial economic consequences. Business circles are extremely worried by the current confused situation and are showing extreme caution, particularly by avoiding the implementation of long-term plans or investing capital in new equipment and construction. This in turn further destablizes the U.S. economy, which is already crippled. The congressmen, who have been obeying the President's will until very recently, have now objected and refuse not only to confirm the government's original draft budget but even to consider the compromise proposals submitted during the last few days by President Reagan in an effort to find a way out.

What is the main reason for this clash? There appear to be several reasons of both economic and political character. The objections not only of the opposition Democratic Party, but also of many members of the ruling Republican Party, are aroused by the deficit envisaged in the draft budget: the huge figure of $182 billion. In other words, the government envisages that in the coming financial year budget expenditures will be $182 billion higher than revenues. The Reagan administration has decided to live on credit with a very impressive debt. For many years federal budget planners in the United States have not managed to make ends meet and the government debt is growing every year as a result. This has a very negative effect on the American economy.

While running for president Reagan promised to put an end to the harmful practice of deficit budgets and thus made laying the foundations of the economic recovery of the country one of the main points of his campaign platform. Reagan reaffirmed his promise on coming to the White House. A month after becoming President he proclaimed an economic recovery program that carried the following figures: In 1983 the budget will not be balanced and its deficit will amount to $23 billion and in 1984 the state budget will be fully balanced. The President promised to have not only a balanced budget in 1985 but revenues surpassing expenditures by $7 billion and, according to the President's pledge, the surplus would reach $30 billion in 1986. But instead of a balanced budget or even a modest budget deficit of $23 billion, the President submitted to the legislators a financial plan for 1983 with a deficit of $182 billion.

This has now led to what I would reluctantly call a panic among American legislators. They are shocked not so much by the exorbitant inconsistency between the electoral promises and actual deeds of the government — this does not surprise anyone in America — as by the extremely dangerous consequences of this state of affairs for the country's economy. However, the greatest concern of the legislators and of American business leaders is aroused by the fact that in all this they actually see the failure of the entire government economic program, the proof of the inconsistency of the ideas on which it is based. A very conservative economist who is closely associated with the business world, (?Kevin Phillips), noted a few days ago that the question is no longer whether Reagan will succeed in implementing his economic policy or will suffer defeat. It has become obvious that he has already suffered that defeat.

The authors of the Republican administration's economic plans thought that by freeing the large corporations of a considerable part of taxes, they would achieve an expansion of production with the aid of funds saved by corporation owners and this would lead to economic development that would make it possible to cope with the military expenditures and liquidate the chronic budget deficit. A year and a half is a sufficient period in which to check on the feasibility of economic plans prepared by the Reagan administration. It is now being discovered that the plans were built on sand, and this is producing growing disenchantment among American business leaders who initially had faith in Reagan's plan. Moreover, the discontent of the business leaders was rapidly reflected in the mood of the American congressmen; thus their sudden courage with respect to Reagan and his government.

It should be added that U.S. congressional elections will be held at the beginning of November. Those to whom the President has now submitted his budget plans will have to face the voters who bear the great burdens connected with the government's arms race and unrealistic economic projections. In such circumstances many congressmen have found it appropriate to disassociate themselves from Reagan's economic policy and publicly demonstrate their opposition to the policy. This has led to the conflict that has now arisen between the legislative and the executive bodies in Washington. It is difficult to tell how this conflict will be resolved. It will have to be resolved somehow, because the administration will not be able to function without a confirmed budget. It is possible that some kind of compromise will be found. Yet the very fact of an open clash between the Reagan administration and the Congress indicates a most serious lack of success of the government ever since it took office.

SENATORS CRITICIZE REAGAN ARMS PROPOSALS

LD170732 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 17 May 82

[Text] Washington, 17 May, TASS -- The Reagan administration's "initiatives" with regard to "control" over strategic armaments were sharply criticized by prominent politicians such as Senators Edward Kennedy and Mark Hatfield. They stressed in an article published in the Washington POST today that Reagan's proposals will start a new round of the arms race as a result of deployment of mobile-based intercontinental ballistic MX missiles, Pershing-2 missiles and other modern types of nuclear arms. The Reagan plan, the article says, leaves untouched the bombers, and cruise missiles. It will require new enormous extra appropriations for the arms race.

The senators disprove the administration's assertions that the balance of strategic forces in the world "has changed" in favour of the Soviet Union. They say that there is continued approximate parity in the correlation of forces and that either side, even after it was hit by a first strike, can destroy the other many times over.

The Reagan administration, the senators write, intends to use new types of arms as "trump cards" in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Such a position cannot facilitate arms control but can only lead to an intensification of the arms race.

As is known, Edward Kennedy and Mark Hatfield submitted to the Senate a resolution which was widely supported and which called for an immediate freeze of nuclear arms arsenals and subsequent Soviet-American talks on the reduction of such arms. In their article in the Washington POST they point out that the movement for freezing nuclear armaments has spread far and wide in the country, to all segments of American society. The senators say that it would be possible with the help of freezing to prevent the deployment of new arms systems and to save at least 100 billion dollars within the next five years.

It is said in the article that a new massive arms build-up should be avoided during arms reduction talks.

AUSTRALIAN PRIME MINISTER ARRIVES IN U.S.

LD170926 Moscow TASS in English 0915 GMT 17 May 82

[Text] Washington, 17 May, TASS -- John Malcolm Fraser, the prime minister of Australia, has arrived here. He is to hold tomorrow talks with President Ronald Reagan, defence secretary Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of the Treasury Donald Regan and other officials.

According to a UPI report, Fraser's visit to the USA is taking place at a time when there is growing dicontent in Australia with the Conservative government's economic policy. The news agency speculates that he may use the status of Washington's loyal ally to try to secure Washington's support for Australia's economic interests at the forthcoming Versailles meeting of the leaders of the biggest Western states, to be held in June. Although Australia will not attend this meeting it would like to have beforehand the Reagan administration's promise to pressure its West European partners to lift discriminatory trade restrictions on Australian goods.

During the talks the two sides are expected to discuss the Anglo-Argentine conflict over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. In the opinion of observers, there will be hardly any surprises in this matter since both the USA and Australia openly support London's colonial claims.

One of the topics of discussion will be joint American-Australian plans for increasing military presence in the Pacific and stepping up the activity of the ANZUS bloc. As is known, with the coming of the Reagan administration to power the United States has shown increased interest in this bloc to which the Pentagon assigns the role of an active proponent of its great-power policy in the region.

UPI mentions serious disagreements between the two sides, especially in matters of economic cooperation. Thus the Australian premier intends to bring to the knowledge of this U.S. administration his concern over the high level of bank rates which are hitting hard at the national economy and lead up to the growth of inflation and unemployment in Australia.

SR-71 MAKES FORCED LANDING IN NORTHERN NORWAY

PM140953 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 May 82 p 3

[TASS report: "Forced Landing"]

[Text] Oslo, 8 May — An American SR-71 spy plane has made a forced landing in the north of Norway, the local press reports. The aircraft's hydraulic system failed. It had been flying off Norway's northern coast in direct proximity to the USSR's borders.

This is already the third forced landing by American surveillance aircraft in Norway in the past 12 months.

VOLSKIY ON BUSH'S PRC VISIT, U.S.-PRC RELATIONS

OW162238 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 16 May 82

[Volskiy commentary: "Dangerous Partnership"]

[Text] Listeners, U.S. Vice President Bush's recent visit to China caught the attention of political observers. This is not only because it was the first contact at this high level between the Beijing leadership and the present Washington administration's authorities but, more importantly, because Bush's Beijing talks took place at a time when the international situation was becoming more intense and when all countries, particularly the permanent members of the UN Security Council, were taking on special responsibilities. The Beijing talks were eye-catching also because, as was the intention of the participants, the talks were to clear up differences between them on such issues of primary importance to China as the Taiwan issue. Because the U.S. supplies modern weapons to Taiwan, the issue has intensified. Now please listen to a commentary by Soviet international journalist Volskiy:

Washington has refused to end this supply. Thus, it has become clear that the present U.S. administration is continuing to pursue a "two-Chinas" policy, which is an insult to the Chinese people. The question lies not only in the political aspect of this policy but in its military aspect.

The United States has turned Taiwan into a huge U.S. arsenal in the Far East, directly threatening China's security. The island seized from China can to a very great extent be included in a chain of military bases set up by the Pentagon in East and South Asia. The chain begins from South Korea near China's eastern border, runs through the Philippines and extends to China's southern border. The 40,000-strong U.S. expeditionary force in South Korea is receiving one new weapon after another, including nuclear weapons.

This chain is linked to Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, which washes the southern shores of Asia. We would like to point out that modern transportation can easily reach China's western regions from Diego Garcia. The Americans are turning Diego Garcia into a huge base and storehouse -- a storehouse of nuclear weapons, including, according to Asian press reports, neutron weapons and chemical weapons.

All this has already formed a serious threat to China. What guarantee is there that bellicose elements in the United States will not turn Taiwan into a base similar to Diego Garcia? There is no guarantee. Moreover, there are very reasonable reports that the Taiwan authorities, Israel and South Africa very possibly have already actively begun to produce their own nuclear bombs with the help of certain Americans.

From the above it can be seen how serious a threat the policy of U.S. imperialist groups has posed to the Chinese people. This threat is not abstract; it is real. Moreover, as recent events have shown, these groups are prepared to use any means of blackmail and pressure in dealing with some countries regarded as friendly toward the United States, such as countries pursuing policies that no longer prove satisfactory to the imperialists. The latest historical example is that the United States has given full support to Britain's act of aggression against Argentina over the Falkland Islands -- that is, the Malvinas Islands. International observers all regard this act as an imperialist attempt to psychologically pressure not only Argentina but other countries, including China.

It should be seen that when China is confronted by the Taiwan or Hong Kong question, this is to a certain extent similar to the Falkland Islands question. The imperialists have dropped a hint to their partners that as partners they cannot act as their national interests demand, and that as partners they should obey the imperialists' will. Otherwise, the imperialists will use political, economic and military weapons of one kind or another against them.

Of course, U.S. Vice President Bush may not have openly said these things to his counterparts during the Beijing talks. Nevertheless, his visit to the Chinese capital was meant to put pressure on China concerning the Taiwan issue.

For strategic and aggressive reasons the present U.S. administration refuses to make more or less actual concessions to the Chinese leaders on this issue. At the same time the U.S. administration is trying hard to more extensively involve the Beijing leadership in the U.S. global strategy directed against socialist and national liberation forces.

Naturally, the concrete results of Bush's visit to China will be determined thoroughly after a period of time. However, it is very clear now that the Beijing talks once again revealed the dangerous nature of the notorious partnership between U.S. imperialist groups and the Beijing leadership. It is dangerous to universal peace and to the Chinese people's fundamental interests.

The present Beijing leaders are going farther and farther down the unreliable road of partnership with imperialism. A concrete proof is that the U.S. administration is confident that despite Washington's refusal to make any concession and its provocative tone the Chinese leaders will adopt an obliging attitude toward the U.S. administration. The Chinese leaders' statements on the friendly and sincere exchange of views are more proof of this. According to them, such an exchange of views was made during Bush's visit to Beijing.

PRC REPORT ON SUPPRESSION OF AFGHANS ATTACKED

LD141710 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 14 May 82

["TASS political commentator Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow, 14 May, TASS — The Beijing newspaper RENMIN RIBAO, that is long specialising in anti-Soviet inventions, has outdone itself by publishing a report alleging that the Moscow militia had "manhandled a peaceful demonstration of Afghan students."

As we were informed at the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the USSR and at the Association of Afghan Students Studying in the Soviet Union, the report in RENMIN RIBAO is a crude fabrication, a lie from beginning to end. It is noteworthy that the first inventions about "clashes" that had supposedly taken place in Moscow between Afghan students appeared in the Western press. As to the Beijing propaganda men who, as is known, readily parrot even the most absurd anti-Soviet concoctions of the Western slanderers, this time not only picked up the new fabrication but tailored it in their own manner, transforming the canard about "clashes" into a "sensational" pasquinade about "militia suppressing peaceful students." In other words, the people in Beijing turned an ordinary lie into a double lie, and once again fell flat on their faces.

USSR, JAPAN SIGN KELP GATHERING ACCORD IN MOSCOW

OW160815 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 15 May 82

[Text] Negotiations on Japanese kelp-gathering in Soviet territorial waters around Signalny Island have ended in Moscow. They were held at the Soviet Ministry of Fish Industry on 11-14 May, with a delegation of Hokkaido fisheries circles attending on the Japanese side.

At the end of the negotiations, which proceeded in an amicable atmosphere, the two sides signed an agreement stipulating the kelp gathering terms, such as concerning the period, sea zone and the number of boats permitted. Under the agreement, 330 boats of small-scale fishermen in Hokkaido will be able to gather kelp in Soviet waters this year.

Soviet head delegate (Klimov), deputy chief of the Foreign Operations Department of the Soviet Ministry of the Fish Industry, spoke at the signing ceremony. He said: Our negotiations have been carried out in the spirit of mutual understanding and good neighborliness. I believe that the agreement will contribute to promoting fishery and economic cooperation between the two sides. We are also convinced that this agreement will contribute to developing good neighbor relations between the Soviet Union and Japan. The Soviet Union has shown understanding of and sympathy for the desire of the Japanese fishermen and we expect that this will be correctly appreciated by the small-scale Japanese fishermen who will soon begin kelp gathering.

In conclusion, the deputy chief of the foreign operations department expressed the hope that all provisions of the agreement will be observed. After the signing ceremony a Moscow radio reporter interviewed Shinzo Kobayashi, head of the Japanese delegation and chairman of the Hokkaido Fisheries Federation, on the impact the agreement will have on fishermen in Hokkaido. Kobayashi said:

[Begin recording] This will enable small fishermen in Hokkaido to keep on earning a living. Therefore, I feel obliged to express my heartfelt gratitude to the real kindness shown by the Soviet Union. We will do our best to see that our fishermen will never violate the agreement in their actual operations. Moreover, from the viewpoint of Japan-USSR friendship and good will I think that this marks the first major step in paving the way for friendly relations. I am pleased with this agreement as an achievement of great significance. The negotiations have been very smooth and I am greatly satisfied with them. [end recording]

KIM IL-SONG THANKS BREZHNEV FOR GREETINGS

PM141037 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 82 p 1

[Untitled Kim Il-song message to L. Brezhnev]

[Text] To Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium:

I send to you, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium thanks for the congratulations and good wishes that you sent on my birthday.

I will take this opportunity to express confidence that the relations of traditional friendship and cooperation between the parties and peoples of the two countries -- Korea and the Soviet Union -- will continue to further strengthen and develop, and I wish you new successes in your responsible work aimed at the prosperity and development of Soviet society and at increasing the Soviet people's well-being.

[Signed] Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Korean Workers Party Central Committee and president of the DPRK

TV CARRIES PREDEPARTURE REMARKS BY DRA'S KARMAL

LD142110 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 14 May 82

["Interview" with Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, given before his departure from Termez on 14 May -- in Dari with superimposed Russian translation; from the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Dear comrades, I want to express my profound satisfaction with the fact that the fraternal and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the DRA are daily becoming stronger. There is no force in the world that could shake these relations. At the source of friendship between our peoples stands great Lenin. Today we are all witnesses to the fact that the CPSU leadership and the Soviet state, headed by Comrade Brezhnev, is steadily implementing Lenin's principles and making them a reality. We are grateful for this with all our hearts.

Our delegation came to Uzbekistan to take part in the ceremonial opening of a vehicle and railroad bridge over the Amu-Darya River. For all of us the events during these days became an unforgettable celebration that opens a new page in the development of multilateral, mutually profitable and friendly Soviet-Afghan relations. We do not consider the construction of the bridge over the Amu-Darya just as economic and technical aid from the Soviet Union to our young republic. It is something more important: The construction of this project and its commissioning well ahead of schedule is a reflection of quite new relations, good neighborliness and friendship between our countries and peoples.

Here on the hospitable and sunny land of Soviet Uzbekistan our delegation was given an exceptionally warm welcome and we see in it a demonstration of profound respect and sincere feelings of Lenin's party and the Soviet state, and all Soviet people to our party and country, to working people and to all people of Revolutionary Afghanistan. We are proud of our friendship and trust, its stability and firmness. The coming generations of Afghan people will treasure it and develop it, because this friendship answers its hopes and aspirations.

There can be no happiness or prosperity without peace. We are sincerely grateful to the Soviet Union, our great northern neighbor, for its constant struggle for this invaluable property of mankind. The people of Afghanistan completely support the peaceful proposals of the Soviet country, which Leonid Ilich Brezhnev made during his recent visit to Tashkent. We, on our side, will do all that is possible to implement them.

Dear comrades, the days our delegation spent in the prosperous and hospitable Uzbek land are unforgettable. The visit we paid to Surkhandaryinskaya Oblast and meetings with the republic's working people helped us to see and better understand the striking successes achieved by Uzbekistan's people in a historically short period in all sections of economic, social and cultural life. We have seen a practical implementation of Lenin's great ideas and we know precisely what miracle has changed the ancient land — its name is socialism. Great Lenin showed the path toward it. Your country, guided by the Communist Party under the leadership of the true Leninist and great friend of the Afghan people, Comrade Brezhnev, having built socialism, is following this path with a firm step toward communism.

The successes of the Soviet people inspire all progressive mankind.

In conclusion Babrak Karmal said: These successes are an inalienable part of the struggle of all the world's people for a glorious future, peace, happiness and prosperity.

REPORTAGE ON END OF VISIT OF KAMPUCHEA'S HUN SEN

Visit to Armenia

LD150312 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] Hun Sen, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister, was the guest of Armenia today. He visited the Matenadaran Institute of Ancient Manuscripts, went to the exhibition of the people's economic achievements and took a trip to Lake Sevan.

Visit to Sochi

LD161958 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 16 May 82

[Text] Hun Sen, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, today visited the subtropical gardens of the Scientific Production Association for Industrial Floriculture and Mountain Horticulture in Sochi and toured the environs of this resort town.

Visit Ends; Vacation Beginning

LD170818 Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 17 May 82

[Text] Sochi, 17 May, TASS -- The official visit of Hun Sen, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, to the Soviet Union has been concluded. He will stay in the Soviet Union for a vacation.

TIKHONOV RECEIVES SRV'S ORDER OF GOLD STAR

LD141252 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] By decree of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Comrade Tikhonov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has been awarded the Order of the Gold Star for great contribution in strengthening the development of friendship and all-round cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

SRV FOREIGN MINISTER ON U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE

LD141102 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] Vietnam's Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach has said that the United States is preparing for new chemical warfare and trying to distract the world public from its preparations by lying. He rejected American claims that Vietnam had used lethal chemicals of Soviet make. In an interview for the magazine NEW TIMES [NOVOYE VREMYA] the minister said that during the Vietnam war the United States dumped over 100,000 tons of toxic agents on his country. Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese were injured, thousands of American servicemen suffered and great damage was done to the environment. The consequences of American chemical warfare against the Vietnamese are being felt to this day.

CPSU'S RUSAKOV DEPARTS FOR VISIT TO WARSAW

LD170634 Moscow TASS in English 0629 GMT 17 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 17 May, TASS -- Konstantin Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has left for Warsaw today on the invitation of the Central Committee of the United Polish Workers' Party on a friendly working visit.

POLISH GOVERNMENT DISCUSSES PUBLIC DISORDER

LD151202 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 15 May 82

[Text] Warsaw, 15 May, TASS -- The Polish Government's Presidium at its session here examined the socio-political situation in connection with the attempts, which are being undertaken since early May by certain forces, particularly "Solidarity" operating underground, to thwart the process of stabilisation in Poland, PAP agency reports. It was pointed out at the session that initiators and organisers of the provocations again wanted to cause sentiments of tension and alarm and street disorders with all ensuing consequences. These forces are chiefly worried over the increasingly more apparent signs of the improvement of the social climate, creation of conditions for a calm life and positive changes in the economic field.

Political groupings in Western countries, which are still interested in socio-political and economic destabilisation in Poland, rendered extensive propaganda support for the actions by the organisers of the disorders. Sorties by the opponents of socialist Poland, scheduled for May 13, ended actually in defeat.

The overwhelming part of the people, especially the working class, displayed civic responsibility and maturity. The working people unequivocally declared in favor of tranquility and order in the country, non-stop production rhythm. This is vivid evidence of the fact that mounting in society is the conviction that work and order in the state are the only way out of the social and political crisis, the means to overcome many urgent problems and difficulties which still make themselves strongly felt. The government's Presidium expressed gratitude to the working people for their civic, patriotic position.

The session stressed the need for consistent expansion of actions by the state and economic administration, which help stabilise life and work in the country. Despite the attempts by anti-social groupings to stage disorders, the state authorities are fully resolved to consolidate the national accord platform, uniting around the common goals all the patriotic forces. At the same time, in the name of tranquility of society, the state bodies will consistently struggle against any manifestations of anti-state activity.

TIKHONOV CONDOLENCES ON YUGOSLAV MINE DISASTER

LD161148 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1600 GMT 15 May 82

[Text] Nikolay Tikhonov, chiarman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has sent a telegram of condolences to Veselin Djuranovic, president of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia, which says:

I express sincere condolences in connection with the severe catastrophe, the explosion in the Raspotocje Mine, which has caused the loss of human life. Please convey expressions of profound sympathy to the families of those who died.

HAIG VISIT TO PRESSURE GREEK GOVERNMENT

LD151706 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 15 May 82

[Text] Athens, 15 May, TASS -- The U.S. secretary of state, Alexander Haig, arrived here today. The principal aim of his visit is to put pressure on the Greek Government which refuses to follow blindly in the wake of Washington and its adventurous militarist course. The Reagan administration does not conceal its irritation over the Papandreou government's policy, and is seeking to compel it to submit itself to Washington's diktat.

Mass anti-American demonstrations had been held in Athens and Pyraeus before Haig's arrival in Greece. 20,000 demonstrators demanded the closure of the American bases on Greek soil, Greece's withdrawal from NATO and pursuance of an independent peaceful policy, vitally important to ensure the future of the Greek people.

"Alexander Haig will act at talks with the government as representative of U.S. imperialism, which is seeking to assert its domination in our country and prepare the ground for resuming the action of the anti-national Greek-American treaty of 1953," says a statement by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece. The document says that the government must fulfill its elections pledges and ensure the removal of the American bases within a short period. The Communist Party of Greece described Haig's visit as "undesirable."

Washington, 15 May, TASS -- The Pentagon has notified Congress about its plans to sell Greece surface-to-surface Harpoon missiles for a sum of 32 million dollars. The Defence Department points out that the deliveries of this weaponry will make contribution to ensuring foreign policy and national security tasks of the United States, by improving Greece's possibilities to fulfill its NATO commitments.

The Pentagon notified Congress earlier this month of its plans to sell Greece various artillery arms for a sum of 33 million dollars. The question of the deliveries observers believe, will be discussed during Haig's talks with leaders of the Greek Government.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS U.S. ENVOY'S PARIS TV COMMENTS

LD141810 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 14 May 82

["An 'Anti-Diplomat' in Paris" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 14 May, TASS -- IZVESTIYA calls the U.S. ambassador to France, Galbraith, an "anti-diplomat" in its today's issue. The newspaper points out in its remark that "the White House's extraordinary and plenipotentiary emissary, actively engaged in misinformation," appeared on the TF-1 channel and "took the liberty of grossly intervening in the internal affairs of the country to which he is accredited. Having repeated his earlier attacks on the French Communists, Galbraith attempted to scare both the radio listeners and the multi-million army of TV viewers."

"He views the presence of four Communist ministers in the French Government as a colossal risk. Where does he see the danger? There are no explanations: The point is to scare."

"The unceremonious sortie of the U.S. ambassador, apparently, reflects the fears of his masters," the newspaper remarks. "They must have got worried on the other side of the ocean over the fact that the French press, even those publications which are anything but sympathetic towards the new government, cannot help admitting the competence and efficiency of the Communist ministers. This is also indicated by public opinion polls. The objective appraisal of their activities riles the White House, and it has decided to restore order by calling Paris to task, so that it should not overlook the American position."

"Galbraith has no diplomatic tact. Instead, he is well versed in the strategy and tactics of the White House. In this sense his recent revelations have helped the French TV viewers to get a better idea of the tasks set for the American emissary in Paris," IZVESTIYA concludes.

OSIPOV PRESS CONFERENCE ON 'GAS-PIPES' DEAL

LD141550 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 14 May 82

["A Pipeline of Goodneighborhood and Cooperation" — TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 14 May, TASS -- "The Soviet Union is not imposing its natural gas on anybody. For this reason I would describe as far-fetched the talk one hears at times in the West about the expediency, economic feasibility and even political danger of concluding the so called 'gas-pipes' deal of the century between the USSR and a number of West European countries," a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists here today was told by Deputy USSR Minister of Foreign Trade Nikolay Osipov.

"The Soviet Union is the most reliable trade partner," Nikolay Osipov stressed. "We scrupulously observe and will observe the commitments that we assume. I believe that the Western partners, too, will fulfill their contractual obligations."

Cooperation between the USSR and West European countries in the field of the gas industry has a long tradition. Following Austria, with which the first agreement was concluded in 1968, contracts on the delivery of Soviet gas were signed with the USSR by Italy, the FRG, France and some other countries.

During the past thirteen years deliveries of natural gas from the USSR to Western Europe amounted to 130 billion cubic metres. "Despite the certain difficulties of growth experienced by the Soviet gas industry there was not a single interruption in the supply of gas to our customers," Nikolay Osipov noted. As a result this cooperation has become an important element of strengthening economic ties between the USSR and countries of Western Europe.

In the opinion of the Soviet deputy minister the American policy of embargo will not slow down the construction of the trunk pipeline for the export of gas from Western Siberia to Western Europe and trial deliveries of Soviet gas will be started already at the end of 1983. The USSR has all the necessary machines and equipment to build the gas pipeline itself. As to the equipment purchased in West European countries, it is intended solely for the construction of the export gas pipeline and facilitates in the long run an earlier delivery of natural gas from the USSR to the West European purchasers.

Contracts with West German, French and Italian firms have already been concluded within the framework of the "deal of the century." At present Soviet foreign trade organisations are conducting talks also with companies in Austria, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Spain and Switzerland. Turkey, too, has expressed interest in getting Soviet natural gas.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS PARTY, GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

PM141617 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 82 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS-attributed "Official Section"]

[Text] Making Effective Use of the Grazing Period

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a resolution on measures to increase the output of stockraising products in the 1982 grazing period and to create the necessary fodder stocks for livestock for the 1982-1983 winter period.

The union republic Communist Party central committee and councils of ministers are asked to organize the elaboration and implementation on every farm of measures to increase meat and milk production in the grazing period. Here special attention is drawn to the need for constant provision of succulent fodder for livestock and the creation of every kolkhoz and sovkhoz of an effective fodder conveyor system making the most rational use of pastures, winter crops sown for fodder purposes, perennial and annual grasses and other fodder crops.

The USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Farming, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the USSR State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture, party and soviet organs locally, and kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders must implement additional measures to enhance the productivity of natural fodder land and the yield of fodder crops, take steps to commission in the first half of the 1982 land reclamation systems for organizing intensive fodder production, expanding spring-flood irrigation, watering fodder crops cultivated on unirrigated land, and completing in good time the repair of fodder-harvesting and irrigation equipment; create on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes mechanized teams and detachments and harvesting and transportation complexes for fodder and procurement; and ensure the timely commissioning of silage and cured hay installations and storehouses for hay, grain and forage and grass meal.

Industrial enterprises and organization collectives must be recruited more widely into giving patronage aid to kolkhozes and sovkhozes and fodder storehouses, and they must be notified in good time of the targets for the fulfillment of this work.

The resolution provides for a number of measures for supplying agriculture and the water resources sphere with material and technical facilities.

Targets are set for hay procurement on Goslesfond [presumably a forestry body -- exact expansion unknown] land and for the production of meal from tree leaves.

Union republic councils of ministers are instructed to earmark for the market stock passenger cars and motorcycles for selling to tractor drivers, truck drivers, workers and specialists who secure high indicators in procuring high-quality fodder in 1982.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers expressed confidence that party, soviet and agricultural organs and kolkhoz, sovkhoz and industrial and transport enterprise and organizations collectives, guided by the 26th CPSU Congress decisions, will take all necessary steps for successful fulfillment of the task of further consolidating the fodder base and ensuring the all-round intensification of stockraising.

Preparing in Good Time for Receiving the New Harvest

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have examined the question of additional measures for preparing the USSR Ministry of Procurements material and technical base for receiving and ensuring the safekeeping of grain and oil crop seed from the 1982 harvest and have adopted an appropriate resolution.

Ensuring timely, high-quality preparation of grain reception and grain processing enterprises for the continuous reception, processing and storage of grain and oil crop seed from the 1982 harvest is deemed one of the most important tasks for the union republic Communist Party Central Committees and Councils of ministers, the USSR Ministry of Procurements party raykoms, obkoms and raykoms, ASSR councils of ministers, krayispolkoms, oblispolkoms and rayispolkoms. This preparation of the enterprises must be completed by 1 July in the country's southern regions and by 1 August 1982 in the remaining regions.

The resolution sets targets for constructing and commissioning additionally in 1982, at grain reception and grain processing enterprises, mechanized granaries, stationary grain driers, fork-lift trucks, devices for unloading grain cars, asphalted areas, seed cleaning shops and other production establishments. To fulfill the projected work it is planned to earmark the necessary capital investments and material and technical resources. Procedure is also laid down for involving construction and repair and construction organizations in performing this work.

Chemicalization Program

The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution on the elaboration of a targeted comprehensive program for the chemicalization of the USSR national economy for the period through the year 2000. A commission is being created at the USSR Gosplan to compile the draft of this program. A deadline has been set for presenting the draft program to the USSR Council of Ministers -- the second quarter of 1983.

The USSR Council of Ministers has also adopted resolutions on other questions including:

Improved organization of the restorative repair of casings and fuller utilization of worn tires in the national economy;
Measures for the development of the Pechora coalfield in 1982-1985 and in the 12th 5-Year Plan;
Urgent measures to ensure the commissioning in 1982-1985 of capacities at the Berezovskaya No 1 GRES and Kansk-Achinsk coalfield pits;
Additional measures to ensure the development of the power industry in West Siberian regions;
Measures to meet the national economy's requirements for economical types of packaging in 1982-1985.

CPSU'S GRISHIN ADDRESSES MOSCOW MEETING

LD141802 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] Sociopolitical readings entitled "An Inviolable Union of Free Republics" opened on 13 May in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions in Moscow. They are devoted to the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. Muscovites listened to a report delivered by Comrade Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom. He stressed that the capital of our motherland, a major economic, administrative, political, scientific and cultural center, is a convincing embodiment of the achievements of developed socialism.

Speaking about Moscow's role in the unification of the Soviet republics and the formation of our state, the speaker noted that the capital of the USSR has become a symbol of the inviolable friendship of the Soviet peoples, a symbol of loyalty to the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy, the policy of peace. The task of turning Moscow into an exemplary communist city is being consistently implemented. The sociopolitical readings will last until December.

SHCHERBITSKIY INTERVIEWED TO MARK ANNIVERSARY

LD142142 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] A member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee and the first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, has described the past 60 years as the most fruitful period in the history of his people.

In an interview for the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR, to be marked next December, he said all these years thousands of major industrial facilities have been built in the Ukraine with the help of other Soviet peoples. The republic now leads Europe in the production of coal, iron ore, steel and pig-iron.

SHEVARDNADZE ATTENDS GEORGIAN CP PLENUM

LD141206 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum which opened today in Tbilisi is devoted to the development of science and scientific-technical progress. The plenum participants are discussing the tasks of party organizations to speed up scientific-technical progress in the republic's national economy. Participating in the work of the plenum is Comrade Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

COMMITTEE NOTES ARMENIANS' RETURN TO HOMELAND

NC151803 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] The State Committee of Armenia for the Acceptance of Armenians Returning to the Homeland from Foreign Countries has announced that during the past 30 years more than 250,000 Armenians have returned to the homeland from other countries.

LITHUANIANS APPEAL FOR RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

LD141056 Vatican City in Lithuanian to Europe 1700 GMT 23 Apr 82

[Report from "The Foreign Press About Lithuania"]

[Text] "Do not place us like Negroes into a position without any rights, and do correct the harm done to us."

In Dambrava Village, Prienaiskiy Rayon, 46 believers have sent the following statement to the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

In 1919 our fathers in the village of Dambrava built a small wooden chapel to the glory of the Savior and the Most Holy Mary. People of good will restored this chapel in the summer of 1981. Party officials in the rayon did not fail to notice this. On 28 September the architect of Prienaiskiy Rayon, (?Lepstutis), accompanied by two arrested persons, destroyed the chapel. Two deeply moved believing women succeeded in rescuing from a loaded truck the statue of Mary and a cross. The believers placed this statue and the cross on the foundations of the destroyed chapel. Women adorned this holy place by planting flowers around the foundations.

Love of God and loyalty to one's faith was not to the liking of senior workers of the party. On 9 October Raykom Secretary Levanauskiene arrived at the place where the chapel used to stand. One could not help but observe with astonishment the hatred and fury with which she kicked the flowers and removed the cross and statue. Levanauskiene took the desecrated cross and statue away. Empty foundations remained.

Women once again planted flowers and adorned the surroundings. But there was no limit to the hate of the atheists. Rayon officials sent a tractor driven by Puchkov, a Belorussian. But he refused to destroy the foundations. Surrounded by flowers and love of the believers, and stubbornly defended, the foundations remained intact.

We the undersigned believers demand that senior party officials shall not tread under foot the name of the most democratic country, shall not place us like Negroes into a position without any rights, and shall correct the harm done to us. The chapel must remain in its place. The signatures of 46 believers follow.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 14-16 MAY REPORTED

LD150056/160146/170142 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

14 May

The first 100,000 hectares of spring wheat have been sown in Kurganskaya Oblast. Spring wheat will occupy more than 1 million hectares here. For the first time almost three-quarters of the wheat area is being used for promising intensive varieties bred in Siberia and locally. (0600 GMT)

Sowing of corn has been completed in Chadry-Lungskiy Rayon of Moldavia. Time lost through bad weather has been recouped. Sowing is nearing completion in Moldavia. Altogether 350,000 hectares allotted to corn are being cultivated by industrial methods. Despite bad weather this spring, sowing of sunflower has been completed in the Ukraine. The crop occupies over 1.5 million hectares. (1300 GMT)

Sowing of grain crops has been completed in Lithuania. Although the area has been increased by 25,000 hectares, the work took 10 days less than last year. Shock speed work has been ensured by the overall use of the Ipatevo method and cooperation by farmers with scientists. Spring crops have been sown on the second million hectares on farms in Rostovskaya Oblast. The sowing of corn and sunflowers is currently in progress. Great attention is being given to these crops on the Don. On large areas, sowing is carried out with the aid of industrial technology. (1500 GMT)

The first 100,000 hectares of the spring crop area have been sown in Buryatskaya ASSR. The main food crops, wheat, has been planted on almost one-third of the whole area. Farms are now carrying out the sowing of spring rye, barley, oats and perennial and annual grasses. (2005 GMT)

15 May

Field work is under way in Altayskiy Kray. Clean fallow has been prepared over an area of 830,000 hectares. All farms have good seeds: 88 percent of the seeds are of first or second class. (0100 GMT)

Farmers in Stavropolskiy Kray have pledged to produce 500,000 tons more hay than they did last year. (0104 GMT)

Grain sowing has started in the Kazakh virgin lands. Kustanayskaya Oblast is to sow more than 3 million hectares, and Tselinogradskaya Oblast, 2.4 million hectares. Grain is also to occupy the largest part of the land in Kokchetavskaya, Turgayskaya and Severo-Kazakhstanskaya Oblasts. It is planned to sow the grain from 15-25 May. The new varieties Tselinnaya-21 and Omskaya-9 are being sown more widely than before, tests have shown that these strains yield 2-3 more quintals per hectare than the traditional Saratovskaya-29. (0400 GMT)

Fourteen million hectares are to be sown with barley and wheat in Kazakhstan. Mineral fertilizers will be put down at the same time. Under the conditions of this year's dry spring, sowing will be done in as short a time as possible in order to conserve moisture. (0600 GMT)

Farmers in Kustanayskaya Oblast have allotted 4.2 million hectares for cereal crops. (0700 GMT)

The sowing of sugar beet has been completed in Tambovskaya Oblast. It covers almost 118,000 hectares. Farmers are hoping the yield will be 200 quintals per hectare. (0900 GMT)

16 May

Farmers in Kuybyshevskaya Oblast have completed the sowing of sugar beet on over 16,000 hectares. Farmers in Buryatskaya ASSR have sown the first 100,000 hectares of spring crops. Wheat is the main food crop and is sown on 33 percent of the area. The mass planting of potatoes has begun in Udmurtskaya ASSR, and the sowing of flax and fodder crops has begun. (0100 GMT)

Farmers in Kurganskaya Oblast have started the mass sowing of grain crops, which will occupy almost 1.8 million hectares this year. To date spring crops have been sown on 1 million hectares in the Ryazanskaya nonchernozem zone. The sowing of wheat, barley, oats, millet and buckwheat is almost finished. The sowing of rice is being completed in Krasnodarskiy Kray. Rice occupies over 180,000 hectares here. (0204 GMT)

The planting of potatoes is being carried out on the last hectares today in many southern and central areas of Chuvashskaya ASSR. (0600 GMT)

In Altayskiy Kray, 500,000 hectares, or one-tenth of the whole area, have been sown with spring crops. The farmers have completed the sowing of peas and other pulse crops in a very short time. These crops have been sown on 120,000 hectares. (1300 GMT)

The sowing of early grain crops has been completed in Kuybyshevskaya Oblast. In the current year the newly zoned grain varieties will occupy some 900,000 hectares, including millet Bezenchukskaya-10 and the Kinelskaya early ripening variety, the spring wheat Kutulukskaya and Bezenchukskaya-139. These strains, compared with ones previously used, produce an additional yield of 2-2.5 quintals per hectare. For the first time it is planned to apply liquid ammonia on large areas. Application of 1 quintal of liquid ammonia produces an additional grain yield of 2-3 quintals and an additional corn green bulk yield of 50-60 quintals. (2100 GMT)

SPRING AGRICULTURAL SITUATION REVIEWED

CSA Figures

PM141631 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 82 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed "Agricultural Review": "May Fields"]

[Excerpt] According to USSR Central Statistical Administration figures, by 3 May 40.6 million hectares of spring crops had been sown in the country including 23 million hectares of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn).

Spring wheat had been planted on 3.3 million hectares, spring barley on 11.9 million hectares and pulse crops on 3 million hectares. Sugar beet occupied over 2 million hectares, cotton covered 3.2 million hectares and flax 345,000 hectares.

Potatoes had been sown on 633,000 hectares and vegetables on 567,000 hectares.

All union republics are carrying out sowing.

The final days of April and the first days of May were marked by a perceptible increase in the pace of field work. In the last week, for example, 10.4 million hectares of spring crops were planted in the RSFSR. This is double the amount in the same week last year. In all, there were 17.2 million hectares of spring crops in the RSFSR by 3 May, as opposed to 11.8 million by this date in 1981.

All Volga region oblasts and autonomous republics have launched sowing work. Volgograders have planted spring crops on over half the area allotted to them.

The Bashkirskaya ASSR's machine operators are working smoothly. During the last 7 days they planted more than 1 million hectares of spring crop seed. Orenburg's farmers are sowing at equally high rates. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Kurganskaya, Permskaya and Chelyabinskaya Oblasts have begun sowing. The first 30,000 hectares have been sown in Altayskiy Kray and 70,000 hectares in Krasnoyarskiy Kray. Over 2 million hectares of spring crops have been sown in a week in the Non-Chernozem Zone.

Over a large part of the country's European territory, the weather promoted the development of winter crops in the appearance of sturdy spring crop shoots. Rain (between 15-20 millimeters) fell in the left-bank Ukraine, Rostovskaya, Kurskaya and Orlovskaya Oblasts, in northern Kustanyaskaya Oblast and locally in Kurganskaya, Orenburgskaya and Irkutskaya Oblasts.

Over the week in the country as a whole, 16.2 million hectares of spring crops and 10.4 million hectares of grain and pulse crops were sown. Let us note that the indicators for the previous week were 5.8 million and 2.7 million hectares respectively. Sowing is being carried out by arable farmers in 61 RSFSR oblasts and autonomous republics, all Ukrainian oblasts and 10 Kazakh oblasts.

Last week machine operators sowed corn well both for grain and for silage. Grain crops have now been planted on over 1.1 million hectares, of which 880,000 hectares were planted by industrial techniques. Silage grain occupied over 1.5 million hectares.

Agriculture Ministry experts note the good condition of natural fodder-producing lands. And this, of course, is gratifying, since the late spring delayed somewhat the transfer of livestock to maintenance on pasture lands. It must be taken into account there that, after last year's drought, livestock was wintered this year under complex conditions, with a marked fodder shortage.

Spring Sowing Progress

LD142014 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0100 GMT on 14 May broadcasts a program on the progress of spring sowing throughout the country. The program is presented by Semen Astakhov. He reports that spring crops occupy about 66 million hectares in the country as a whole. He says that in spite of the vicissitudes of the weather, rural machine operators have managed to exceed the sowing rate of previous years. Sowing conditions in the European area of the USSR are very good; the seeds are being planted in warm and moist soil. Rain has fallen in Saratovskaya, Pensenskaya and many other oblasts of the Russian Federation, and in the Ukraine, Belorussia and other areas.

Vladimir Lyashko reports from the Kazakhstan virgin lands that mass sowing of wheat, the main food crop, will begin on 15 May. Sowing of wheat, barley and millet began in Pavlodarskaya Oblast several days ago. Almost 16 million hectares are to be sown to grain crops in the virgin lands between 15 and 25 May.

Anatoliy Shpakhov reports from Altayskiy Kray that sowing has begun in the foothills of the kray, where the climate is gentler and more moist. Sowing of wheat, barley and oats will begin in central Altayskiy in 3 or 4 days. Sowing of grain crops in the kray's main growing area, the (Rubtsovsk-Aley) and Kulunda steppes, will start on 20 May. Individualized agricultural plans have been worked out for each of the over 600 farms in the kray. The Altay's farmers are not very happy with spring this year. The weather this May is cold, and the soil in the steppe regions lacks moisture.

Reporting on field work in Omskaya Oblast, Leonid Kudryavskiy says that the weather at the end of April and the beginning of May was hot and summerlike. But this was followed by a cold snap. And there were blizzards in some areas. However, it has warmed up again. This year moisture in the soil is worth its weight in gold. Machine operators are using stubble drills to retain as much moisture as possible.

Speaking from Krasnodarskiy Kray, (Bratnikov), the first secretary of Yeyskiy Raykom, says that the rayon sold 556,000 tons of strong wheat to the state during the 10th 5-Year Period. This was almost 90 percent of the total for all of Krasnodarskiy Kray. Farms in the rayon spent about R4 million on improving the quality of the grain and received about R15 million in additional income for their efforts. Thus every ruble spent on raising the quality of the grain produced 3 rubles 16 kopeks in extra profit for the farms.

Agriculture Official's Report

LD142256 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0805 GMT 14 May 82

[Report by Yuriy Alekseyevich Nikitin, deputy chief of the Main Directorate of Grain Crops of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture; date not given -- recorded]

[Text] In the last few days the rates of sowing have increased considerably. According to USSR CSA data over the past week, spring crops were planted on 25 million hectares, including grain and pulse crops, excluding corn, over an area of about 15 million hectares. As things stood on 10 May, spring crops were sown on 66 million hectares and grain and pulse crops on 37 million hectares. The crop farmers of Orenburgskaya Oblast have been putting in some shock work. In 1 week they sowed grain crops on 1.6 million hectares, and in Saratovskaya Oblast it was almost 1 million hectares. The sowing of early grain crops was practically completed by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, the Central-Chernozem Zone, Volgogradskaya, Ulyanovskaya, Bryanskaya, Ryazanskaya and Moskovskaya Oblasts and the Bashkir and Chuvash Autonomous Republics.

Close to fulfilling the plan for sowing are the farms of the majority of oblasts of the Central and Volga-Vyatka economic regions, except for the Mari ASSR, Ivanovskaya, Kostromskaya, Yaroslavskaya and Kirovskaya Oblasts. Winter crops are mainly in good shape. It is necessary now to give them particular attention and in a timely manner to carry out -- where it is needed -- dressing with herbicides, and to dress the sown crops of winter rye with (kompazan) and winter wheat with (pur) which will allow subsequent lodging of plants to be ruled out.

Sowing is continuing for pulse crops. They are planted on more than 70 percent of the planned area. The plan for sowing them was overfulfilled by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Lithuanian SSR. Farms in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Moldavia and Kirghizia are near to completing sowing. In order to increase the production of protein fodder it is necessary this year to ensure not only fulfillment but overfulfillment of the plan for sowing of pulse crops. Sowing of buckwheat is proceeding at a good pace in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Vinnitsa, Donetskaya, Kirovogradskaya, Sumskaya, Kharkovskaya, Khmelinitsskaya and Chernigovskaya Oblasts. In all the republics more land is occupied by millet than in previous years. Rice has been sown on half of the planned areas. The sowing of this crop has virtually been completed by the farms of Tashkentskaya, Surkhandarinskaya, Namangansakaya, Chimkentskaya, Crimea and Khersonskaya Oblasts. However, the farms of the North Caucasus are notably lagging in sowing this crop.

The plan for sowing corn was already fulfilled by 70 percent. In the past week it has been sown on 1.4 million hectares. In Central Asia and south Kazakhstan in many of the sown areas good vigorous shoots of this crop were obtained. Sugar beet has already been sown on more than 80 percent of the planned area. Thinning of beets is being carried out by the farms of Kirgizia, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Ukraine, Moldavia and the Russian Federation. Potatoes have been planted on more than 1.2 million hectares. The mass planting of tubers is being carried out by the farms of the Baltic region, and the central and Volga-Vyatka economic regions of the Russian Federation. Vegetable crops were sown on almost 60 percent of the planned area. In sheltered ground the picking is continuing of cucumbers, tomatoe, spring onions, lettuce and other hothouse and hotbed vegetables. The planned delivery of them is proceeding to the procurement and trading organizations.

Sowing of fodder crops is proceeding in an organized manner. Already more than 5.5 million hectares have been sown of perennial grasses with and without cover crops. Special attention is being paid to irrigating the sown areas of leguminous crops. Annual grasses were sown on approximately the same area. Their sowing was completed in the Kabarada-Balkar ASSR, in Stavropolskiy Kray, in Belgorodskaya, Voronezhskaya and Astrakhanskaya Oblasts. Considerable areas were occupied by fodder root crops and fodder cucurbits, and corn for silage and green fodder.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS EXTEND INTO KARA KUM DESERT

LD141028 Moscow TASS in English 0944 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] Ashkhabad, 14 May, TASS — A land cultivation zone is extending ever deeper into the Kara Kum Desert, which occupies the major part of Turkmenia, the southernmost and the hottest Soviet Central Asian republic. The area of irrigated land in the republic has reached one million hectares. Half of the cotton produced in Turkmenia, a lot of vegetables, fruit and grapes are grown on formerly desert lands which have not been cultivated for centuries.

These achievements would be impossible without the selfless assistance of other Soviet republics, a TASS correspondent was told by Turkmenia's minister of land reclamation and water management, Annamurad Khodzhamuradov. The republic possesses a ramified network of irrigation canals, collectors and drains, powerful pumping stations and other hydrotechnical works. Water reservoirs with a capacity of 1,600 million cubic meters have been built. The 1,100-kilometre-long Kara Kum Canal has irrigated 500,000 hectares, mainly virgin lands.

The minister said that the area of irrigated lands has increased threefold as against 1924, the year of the establishment of the Turkmen Republic. Cotton output has gone up by 16 times. Its annual production reached 1,200,000 tons, 25 percent of it being fine-staple cotton.

Turkmen irrigators have worked out ambitious plans for the current five-year period (1981-1985), the minister pointed out. The through capacity of the Kara Kum Canal will be almost doubled to reach 800 cubic metres per second. The whole of the canal bed is being deepened and widened. A water reservoir will be put into operation on the Murgab River with a capacity of over 600 million cubic metres. The water of the Amu Darya River will move northward by the 180-kilometre-long Tashauz Canal. It is planned to irrigate another 100,000 hectares of virgin lands. The construction of the Zeid artificial sea with a capacity of over 3,000 million cubic metres, one of the major water reservoirs in Central Asia, is under way in the area near the Amu Darya River, where the Kara Kum Canal rises.

BRIEFS

TURKMEN FINE-FIBER COTTON -- A new department concerned with developing fine-fiber cotton in the republic has been established at the agricultural sciences faculty of the Turkmen Agricultural Institute imeni Kalinin. The new department, whose main task is to discover and develop new types of fine-fiber cotton, will also train highly-skilled agricultural cadres. [Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1545 GMT 15 May 82 GF]

NAMANGAN RICE — Namangan Oblast's farmers have cultivated rice over an area of 1,600 hectares of land to date. [Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 15 May 82 GF]

SOYUZ T-5 LINKS UP WITH SALYUT-7 ORBITAL STATION

LD141642 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 14 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 14 May, TASS -- The Soyuz T-5 space ship was docked with the Salyut-7 orbital station today at 15 hours 36 minutes Moscow time. The Salyut 7-Soyuz T 5 manned research complex began to function on near-terrestrial orbit after Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev transferred to the station.

The Salyut-7 station is a perfected variant of second generation orbital scientific stations. It has two docking units and improved operational characteristics. The Soyuz T-5 ship was docked on the side of the station's transfer compartment.

The crew of the complex began to reactivate the station and to fulfil the programme of the mission, which provides for:

-- Studies of the surface of the earch and its atmosphere for various sections of the national economy;
-- Astrophysical, medico-biological studies and technological and technical experiments;
-- Tests and adjustment of the improved systems and apparatus of the orbital stations.

According to telemetric data, the onboard systems of the Salyut 7-Soyuz T 5 complex are functioning normally. Cosmonauts Berezovoy and Lebedev are in good health.

At present two Soviet orbital research complexes are in near-Earth space: the Salyut 7-Soyuz T-5 manned complex and the Salyut 6-Cosmos 1267 unmanned complex.

The Salyut-6 station has been orbiting for over four and a half years now. The testing of the equipment and apparatus of the Salyut 6-Cosmos 1267 complex is continuing in conditions of a prolonged stay in the near-Earth orbit. As has already been reported, the artificial Cosmos-1267 Earth satellite is intended for trials of the designs of future spacecraft.

A successful commencement of the work of the piloted scientific-research complex Salyut 7-Soyuz T 5 is a major step forward in creating permanently working orbital stations with a view to the further exploration and peaceful uses of outer space.

Space Complex Parameters

LD151244 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT

[Text] Moscow, 15 May, TASS -- Mission control center has announced the following parametres of the manned research complex Salyut 7-Soyuz T-5: The maximum distance from the Earth's surface is 360 kilometres, the minimum 343 kilometres, period of revolution is 91.3 minutes, inclination is 51.6 degrees.

Cosmonauts Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev completed final operations on mothballing the transport ship Soyuz T-5, and started work on transferring the station into a manned mode of flight.

Today, in accordance with the plan of reactivating the station, the crew are checking the functioning of the systems of life support, energy supply and thermal regulation. The cosmonauts adjusted the teleprinter "Stroka", checked the functioning of the radio communication equipment, and controlled the atmosphere inside the complex.

According to reports by the cosmonauts and telemetric data, the on-board systems of the Salyut-7 station are functioning normally. The parametres of the microclimate in the living quarters of the complex are as follows: temperature 20 degrees centigrade, pressure 840 mm of the mercury column.

The process of adaptation of the cosmonauts to conditions of weightlessness is proceeding normally. The health of the cosmonauts is good; Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev are feeling fine.

Reactivation of Salyut

LD161424 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 16 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 16 May, TASS — A TASS correspondent reports from the mission control centre: Cosmonauts Anatoliy Berezovoy and Valentin Lebedev have been staying for three days onboard the orbital complex "Salyut-7 — Soyuz T-5".

The working day of the crew today started at ten hours and will last till 24 hours Moscow time. The cosmonauts continued plamed operations for reactivation of the station's equipment. The systems of life sustaining, energy supply and thermo regulation have been set in operation. The control checks on the "Delta" system of autonomous navigation have been started. Time was alloted today for the rest of the cosmonauts after their tense work in the previous days.

The reactivation of panels of scientific equipment, inspection and assessment of the state of portholes and checking of the system of the station's orientation are planned for tomorrow.

In sessions of radio and television communication the cosmonauts siad that they feel well and are getting adjusted to the normal pace of work onboard the space station.

TASS REPORTS LAUNCH OF COSMOS-1365 SATELLITE

LD150926 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 15 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 15 May, TASS — The Soviet Union has launched an artificial Earth satellite, Cosmos 1365.

Its on-board scientific equipment is designated for continuing space research.

The satellite's initial period of revolution is 89.6 minutes, maximum distance from the Earth's surface is 276 kilometres, minimum 259 kilometres, inclination of the orbit is 65 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

USTINOV ADDRESS AT ARMY CONFERENCE REPORTED

LD151642 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 May 82

[From the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program]

[Excerpts] The sixth all-army conference of secretaries of primary party organizations was held in Moscow this week.

In his speech at the conference, Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, said in part:

[Begin recording] Comrades, for Soviet people there is nothing more dear than the happiness and security of our [word indistinct]. By their tireless labor all that is necessary to ensure the country's reliable defense capability and the all-round development of the army and navy is created. The concern of the Soviet people for strengthening the country's defense and perfecting the armed forces is reflected in the policy of the Communist Party and its day-to-day leadership in military construction. The party leadership embraces all directions of the activity of the working people, the state organs, the public organizations and officials connected with strengthening the material and spiritual foundations of the country's defense capability and the combat power and combat readiness of the army and navy.

The CPSU elaborates its military policy and military doctrine and organizes their consistent implementation. It directs the development of Soviet military science and military instruction. The party gives constant attention to inculcating in fighting men a profound communist conviction, ardent Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, unshakable devotion to the cause of October and to the heroic revolutionary, battle and labor traditions and readiness to perform acts of heroism in the name of the homeland.

Comrades, the party has laid on us, the Communists of the armed forces, the responsibility of maintaining the army and navy in constant combat readiness. To be always and in everything equal to that responsibility is a matter of our party honor. [deafening applause]

Allow me, on your behalf, to assure the party, the Central Committee, the Politburo and Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev personally that the party organizations and political organs, in close unity with the commanders, will continue actively and resolutely to implement the policy of the CPSU in the army and navy, working tirelessly to fulfill the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress on raising the combat readiness of the armed forces to ensure the reliable defense of the state interests of our homeland. [applause] [end recording]

Representatives of all branches of the armed forces were at the Moscow conference.